

ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

DEC 17 '42 P

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

none  
vol 280  
#555  
Jan. 1943

\*DA

No. 554

OCTOBER, 1942.

Vol. 279

1. India in 1942: The Cripps Mission and After.  
By Sir Verney Lovett, K.C.S.I.
2. Whither?  
By Sir John Marriott.
3. Divorce in the Post-War World.  
By Claud Mullins.
4. The Rat in Britain.  
By Eric Hardy, F.Z.S.
5. Salts of the Earth.  
By Lt-Col P. R. Butler, D.S.O.
6. An Ambassador on Russia.  
By H. C. Foxcroft.
7. Witchcraft.  
By S. Reed Brett.
8. Britain at War.  
By Lord Gorell, C.B.E., M.C.

Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by  
**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

*Sole Agents for American Continent*

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter  
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

**TO SUBSCRIBERS**  
**AND AGENCIES**

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.



THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

No. 554.


PUBLISHED IN  
OCTOBER, 1942.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

NEW YORK:  
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY  
1942

*Entered as Second Class matter at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

 THE QUARTERLY REVIEW is published in January, April,  
July, and October.

Price Thirty-one Shillings and Fourpence per Annum, *post free*.

# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 554.—OCTOBER, 1942.

## Art. 1.—INDIA IN 1942: THE CRIPPS MISSION AND AFTER.

1. *Official Reports of Parliamentary Debates*, 1941–2.
2. *Asiatic Reviews*. April and July 1942.
3. *The Cripps Mission*. R. Coupland. Oxford University Press. 1942.
4. *India and Democracy*. Sir George Schuster, K.C.S.I., and G. Wint. 1941.
5. *Indian News Sheets*. By Sir Louis Stuart, C.I.E. Indian Empire Society.
6. *The Indian States and Indian Federation*. By Sir Geoffrey De Montmorency, G.C.I.E. Current Problems. Cambridge University Press, 1941.
7. *The Round Table*. June 1942.
8. *Modern India and the West*. By L. S. O'Malley. Foreword by Lord Meston, K.C.S.I. Oxford Univ. Press. 1941.
9. *The Princes of India*. By Sir William Barton, K.C.I.E.

'There is no surer way for men and for nations to show themselves unworthy of liberty than by a supine submission and a refusal to fight; to render more difficult the task of those who are fighting for the preservation of human freedom—unless it be to align themselves freely and voluntarily with the destroyers of liberty.'—Cordell Hull.\*

THE months that have passed since January have already produced events of far-reaching importance for India; firstly, the Japanese successes in the Far East, and secondly, the Prime Minister's announcement of March 11 and the Cripps mission. Professor Coupland observes that

'in ill-informed quarters the object of the Cripps mission was said to be "to bring India into the war," the implication

---

\* 'The Times,' July 25, 1942.

being that so far Indians had taken little or no share in the common war effort. This is far from the truth. In the first place the Central Government of India has contained since last summer, besides its three British members and the British Commander-in-Chief, eight non-official Indian members, and it has been assisted by an advisory council of about thirty members almost all of them Indians. Linked with the Central Government are the eleven Provincial Governments, seven of these are now purely official, *owing to the resignation of their Congress Ministers at the onset of the war,\** but four—those of Bengal, the Punjab, Sind, and Orissa—are constitutional governments composed entirely of Indian Ministers supported by majorities in their elected legislatures and exercising the full provisional autonomy established by the Act of 1935. These governments have taken their full share in the general war effort. Thus the Centre and all the provincial governments are war governments, and serving under them are many thousands of Indian officials, all of them as fully committed to the war effort as their confrères of Whitehall. More directly engaged in it are the Indian officers and men of the Indian Army. From the earliest days of the war its famous regiments have been fighting.'

The Princes and Chiefs of the Indian States are with them heart and soul. What then was the object of the Cripps mission in March last? It was

'to explain to the leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people the British proposals for India's attainment of full self-government after the war, and to express in person the Government's desire that on the basis of the proposals those leaders should at once and effectively participate in the councils of their country, "of the Commonwealth and of the United Nations" for the defence of India and the prosecution of the war effort as a whole.'

In spite of the changes made in August 1941† and the expansion of the Governor-General's Executive Council, of the release of Congress anti-war preachers including Mr Gandhi's principal lieutenants, and of the rapidly growing danger of Japanese invasion, the attitude of the Congress remained as unfriendly as ever to the Government, and the relations between the former and

---

\* My italics.

† See my article in the Quarterly of October 1941.

the Muslim League in no way improved. On January 4 last Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and other Liberals sent a wire to Mr Churchill, who was then at Washington, asking for the immediate establishment of a National Government composed of non-officials drawn from all the recognised parties, in fact a government of party leaders, for the restoration of popular government in all provinces and for the representation of India in the Imperial War Cabinet and War Councils. The Muslim League opposed these demands and any modification of the arrangements of the preceding August. In February, India was visited by General Chiang Kai-Shek, whose object was principally to discuss war measures. He also met many leading politicians and public men and renewed an acquaintance with Pundit Jawahirlal Nehru, the Congress leader who had visited him in China about two years before. On his departure from India he emphasised the necessity of collaboration between India and China in the war effort, and expressed his confidence that Britain would give real political power to Indians as speedily as possible 'so that they may be in a position further to develop their spiritual and material strength.' Professor Coupland's impressions of this visit are noteworthy.

All these events and the general wish and disposition in England to meet Indian aspirations in a liberal spirit tended to induce Mr Churchill's Cabinet to make a great effort to solve the Indian question as far as was then feasible. On February 3 Lord Faringdon brought a motion in the Lords to call attention to the Indian situation and ask for papers, arguing that full self-government should at once be given to India. The Congress represented India and was really supported by most Muslims as well as by Hindus. Some one should be sent out to India empowered to negotiate a settlement. Lord Hailey was in favour of leaving negotiations to the Viceroy. Was there any sign that the Congress was willing to abate their claim to be left alone to decide on the form of the new constitution? Was there any sign of growing accommodation between Muslims and Hindus? Did the differences between the Government and the powerful political parties seriously impair the country's war effort? We heard of recruiting stations crowded with men. In provision of equipment great progress had been made. The



relative unpreparedness of India for war was only part of our general unpreparedness and lack of prevision. Whatever were the relations between the Government and the people, we should not have found the Indian political parties ready to incur the very heavy expenditure required in mechanising a modern army. Further gestures of good will might encourage intransigent demands and 'serve to alarm and alienate our friends.' In replying on the Debate the Under-Secretary of State, the Duke of Devonshire, said that the war effort 'had not been seriously or substantially affected by political difficulties.'

On March 11 the Prime Minister stated in the House of Commons that the crisis arising out of the Japanese advance had made the Government wish to rally all the forces of Indian life to guard the country from the menace of invasion. In August 1940 the Government had announced that as soon as possible after the war, India should reach Dominion status under a Constitution to be passed by agreement of Indians among themselves, acceptable to the main elements in their national life. This would be subject to the fulfilment of British obligations for the protection of minorities, including the depressed classes, and of our treaty obligations to the Indian States, as well as of certain lesser matters arising out of our long association with the fortunes of the Indian sub-continent.

In order now to clothe these general declarations with precision and to carry conviction to all classes of the sincerity of their resolve the War Cabinet had agreed unitedly upon conclusions for present and future action which, if accepted by India as a whole, would avoid the alternative dangers either that resistance of a powerful minority would impose an indefinite veto upon the wishes of a majority or that a majority decision might be taken which would be resisted up to a point destructive of internal harmony and fatal to the setting up of a new constitution. But they must first assure themselves that the scheme would 'win a reasonable and practical measure of acceptance and thus promote the concentration of all Indian thought and energies upon the defence of their native soil.' They therefore proposed to send a member of their own body to India, to satisfy himself upon the

spot that the conclusions upon which they had agreed, and which they believed represented a just and final solution, would achieve their purpose. Sir Stafford Cripps, Lord Privy Seal and Leader of the House of Commons, had undertaken the task and would set out as soon as convenient and suitable arrangements could be made. He was in the full confidence of the Government and would strive in their name to procure the necessary measure of assent both from the Hindu majority and from the great minorities among which the Muslims were the most numerous and on many grounds pre-eminent.

The draft declaration drawn up by the War Cabinet was not published till March 30, when Sir Stafford had arrived in India and seen the Viceroy and others. The White Paper which gives it also contains his subsequent correspondence with the Leaders of the main Indian political parties. The declaration differs from that issued on August 8, 1940, in laying down the steps which the War Cabinet proposed should be taken for the earliest possible realisation of self-government in India, the substitution of a new 'Indian Union' for the present Empire which would become a Dominion associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown but would be equal in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs. Immediately upon the cessation of hostilities steps would be taken to set up in India an elected body charged with the task of framing a new constitution. The Indian States would participate in this body. His Majesty's Government would accept and implement forthwith the constitution so framed, subject only to the right of any Province to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession to the Union if desired. With such non-acceding Provinces, should they so desire, His Majesty's Government would agree upon a new constitution giving them the same status as the Indian Union. A treaty would be negotiated between His Majesty's Government and the constitution-making Indian body which would make provision for the protection of racial and religious minorities in accordance with undertakings already given by His Majesty's Government, but

would not impose any restriction on the power of the Indian Union to decide in future its relationship to the other member States of the British Commonwealth. Another provision suggested a method for choosing the constitution-making body ; and the last provision stated that during the present crisis and until the new constitution could be framed His Majesty's Government must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain control and direction of the defence of India as part of their world-war effort ; but the task of organising the military, moral, and material resources of India must be the task of the Government of India with the cooperation of her peoples.

On March 22 Sir Stafford Cripps arrived by air at Delhi and held his first Press Conference that afternoon. The proposals of the Government were discussed with representatives of parties and others, but were not made public till his fourth Press Conference on March 29. The ups and downs of the subsequent negotiations were announced in 'The Times' and have been described by Professor Coupland. They lasted till April 10 and then finally broke down because the Congress insisted that the present Government of India should *now* be replaced by a 'truly National Government,' a Cabinet Government with full power. This issue was sharply projected by the Congress very late in the negotiations, and a barefaced attempt was made to maintain that Sir Stafford had in the first talk told its President that 'there would be a National Government which would function as a Cabinet and that the position of the Viceroy would be analogous to that of the King of England *vis-à-vis* his Cabinet.\* Sir Stafford Cripps in reply pointed out that any attempt to introduce such a system by Convention under existing circumstances would aim at the absolute dictatorship of a Cabinet (nominated presumably by the major political organisations), a measure which would be rejected by all the Minorities and would be inconsistent with the pledges given by His Majesty's Government to protect the rights of those Minorities. But there was no change of attitude in the Congress ; and Mr Jinnah, for the Muslim League, contended that the Draft Declaration

---

\* Azad to Cripps on April 10 and 11: White Paper, p. 14.

did not explicitly pronounce for Pakistan, a separate Muslim India, and so did not go far enough to meet his Party's case. On April 11 Sir Stafford explained the course and upshot of the discussions to the Governor-General's Executive Council and held his last Press Conference. On April 12 he left Delhi for Karachi, and at dawn on April 13 flew back to England. In his farewell broadcast he said :

'Our effort has been genuine. No responsible Indian has questioned the sincerity of our main purpose—the complete freedom of India—and that alone will affect our future relations. But it is the immediate danger that matters most. Let us then put aside the discussions of the last month, while we turn our energies to *the defence of India*, the first step to building a new and free future for the Indian peoples.'

On April 3 Colonel Louis Johnson, head of the American Economic Mission which had been appointed to examine the possibilities of industrial expansion for war purposes in India, had arrived at Delhi; and he had done his best to help when he could in the political discussion; but this was merely a personal effort.

Before Cripps arrived in India, Mr Gandhi, on Feb. 22, in a signed letter in his 'Harijan' had eulogised the spirit of Britain ('The Times,' Feb. 23). 'Cowards,' he said, 'die many times before their death. Let not this be said of us. If we have learnt nothing worse from our contact with the British, let us at least learn their calmness in the face of misfortune.' He visited Delhi and saw Sir Stafford Cripps, with whom he had a talk. He took no part in the discussions, but certainly opposed the proposed settlement.\* Better things may have been expected from him. On Sept. 30, 1939, he had published an article headed 'Conundrums,' stating that his sympathies were wholly with the Allies. The war was resolving itself into one between such democracy as the West had evolved, and totalitarianism as typified by Hitler. At the time of writing he never thought of consistency with his previous statements, but only with truth as it presented itself to him at the time. His published sentiments on the breakdown of the Cripps negotiations are in 'The Times' of April 13—'non-violence resisters wished well

---

\* Coupland, p. 60.

to the English and the Japanese.' The same page shows that these views were not then shared by his friend and 'legal heir' \* Jawahirlal Nehru, who told a Press Conference that he had 'gone to his utmost limits' to come to terms with the British Government as a victory for Germany and Japan would be 'a tragedy for the world.' The fundamental factor to-day was the future of India and what they were going to do about it. In spite of all that had passed they were not going to embarrass the British war effort in India or the effort of 'our American friends who may come here.' He wanted the Indian people to resist the Japanese to the utmost 'in the Congress way.'

The Cripps mission was very fully discussed in the Commons on April 28 and in the Lords on April 29. Sir Stafford told his story lucidly and fully. The Secretary of State in the Lower and the Under Secretary in the Upper Houses were equally clear, and various speeches were made, some of lasting value. I may mention a few points. There was general appreciation of the manner in which the Lord Privy Seal had discharged a task of such high importance. He said truly that the hope of the House that he might succeed had been shared by a great mass of the British people, by the Dominions, and by a multitude of friends of Great Britain and India both in America and elsewhere. Unfortunately, these hopes had been disappointed, but in his view nothing but good would result from the facts that the proposals were made and that the Cabinet sent one of its own number to discuss them in India with the leaders of Indian opinion. Our sincerity of purpose had been demonstrated. The moment was a difficult one for three main reasons: the imminent approach of the enemy to India's shore; the fact that owing to reverses in the East, accompanied by skilful Axis propaganda, defeatism and anti-British sentiment were showing themselves in certain sections of Indian opinion; and thirdly, with the approach of self-government as a reality, differences of views as to the forms which it should take had tended to become more definitely crystallised, and especially the Pakistan scheme—the idea of two separate Indias which even two years

---

\* Gandhi's words.



ago was little more than the vague dream of certain extremists—had come to be the definite and accepted programme of the most powerful Moslem political organisation. The break, however, had come with the Congress over their demand that the Constitution should be reshaped at once.

In the Lords, the Duke of Devonshire pointed out that during the Delhi negotiations there had been at one time 'real risk' that the Indian demand for transferring the political functions of the Commander-in-Chief to Indian hands would gravely affect the morale of the fighting elements in the country—the Punjabi Muslims, the Sikhs, the Marathas, and many others—'to whom concessions to the Congress would be by no means welcome'; but this risk had been overcome by Cripps, and it was not on that issue of Defence that the breakdown occurred. In form, if not in fact, it came upon the question of what sort of temporary government should be in power until the new constitution began to operate. To this question the Lord Privy Seal devoted his greatest efforts, even going so far as to tell the Congress Party that the British representatives in the new government should be reduced to the Viceroy himself and the Commander-in-Chief—these two only. But the Congress leaders insisted on a position for themselves of complete power during the interim period. This would have created a position which none of the Minorities—certainly not the Moslems—would have accepted for a moment, and the situation would have become impossible. 'Sir Stafford Cripps had shown the world that the delay in India's achievement of self-government was due to the difficulties inherent in the Indian situation.' This he thought had had a valuable effect on some of the Indian politicians.

*'They believed that the only thing necessary for the attainment of their desires was that we should be prepared to give. They hardly realised that it was also necessary that they should be prepared to receive. During the whole course of the negotiations there was no recorded instance of any Indian Party leader meeting any other Party leader, not one.'*

Lord Hailey, Lord Warwick, and Lord Samuel criticised adversely the provision for the possible con-

tracting out of Provinces of British India, and the Lord Chancellor pointed out that while the Congress objected to it as destroying the unity of India the Muslim League disliked it because it did not split the sub-continent into Hindu and Muslim zones. Lord Rankeillour thought, in my opinion rightly, that had the proposals 'offered in such haste and in such conditions' been accepted, grave repercussions would have followed later on because an impression would have been created that everything had been settled. Now difficult complications had been brought out and there would be time for all concerned to discuss them and try to find a solution. The Lord Chancellor particularly warned 'well-meaning critics' not to assume that all that was needed to solve the Indian problem was good will and an abstract formula.

The 'Asiatic Review' of July 1942 published a paper read by Sir Alfred Watson, lately editor of the 'Calcutta Statesman'—before a meeting of the East India Association on May 12. Sir Alfred very strongly criticised the Declaration; but we could not go back on it. We were down to bedrock. The Chairman of the meeting, Lord Erskine, lately Governor of Madras, mainly agreed with Watson, observing that it was unfashionable to talk of the trusteeship of England for India, but when he remembered seeing the millions of toilers all over India, the bulk of whom paid no regard to politics, but merely wished for a good monsoon, just government and light taxation, he believed that this country could not easily divest itself of its responsibilities. For good or ill, rightly or wrongly, as the result of the actions of our ancestors, we had become the trustees for the teeming millions of India. All desired that what we now know as the Indian Empire might become a self-governing, healthy, and wealthy community. It would surely be a most shameful act on the part of any British Government to divest itself supinely of its responsibilities, knowing that by clearing out we were handing India back to chaos. Further, he did not believe that any British Government, no matter what political party was in power, would act in so irresponsible a manner.

To return to Indian developments. On July 2 it was announced at Delhi that the membership of the Viceroy's Executive Council had now increased from twelve to

fifteen, of whom eleven were Indians. This meant a wider provincial representation and a more equitable balance between the communities. A membership of defence was created and a new department to handle war transport. Sir Firoz Khan Noon, from the martial Punjab, was appointed Minister of Defence.\* Sir C. P. Ramaswami Mudaliar and the Maharaja Jam Sahib of Nawanagar would join the War Council and the Pacific War Council. Meantime Gandhi and the Congress Working Committee were displeased with the reception given by the world to their latest stroke of policy which was regarded in America as factious, foolish, and injurious to the vital interests at stake. The Delhi proceedings too had been published in the White Paper and had proved that the Congress pretensions to speak for all India were repudiated by all except its own miscellaneous following, a shifting section of 400 millions of sects and peoples. Note was taken, too, of Mr Gandhi's frequent inconsistencies. He had begun the war period by professing his sympathies with Britain and France. Then he had supported the Working Committee's mischievous decision to withdraw Congress Ministers from the Provinces where they were functioning. When pressed by his hotheads, led by Subhas Bose from Bengal, to go further and start a struggle with the Government on the ground that the consent of India had not been obtained to the Declaration of War, he had refused in these words :

'Those who intend to start a struggle immediately must start off on their own initiative. But in such case they should leave the Congress because Army discipline commands it. The Englishman is noted for his loyalty, and that sort of loyalty I expect from my soldiers.'

On June 8, 1940, after the battle of Flanders, he had made a loyal pronouncement, but a month later, on July 6, after the collapse of France, he had published in his paper an open letter to every Englishman counselling abject submission to the Axis.† It contained a passage which informed the Briton that it was 'love' that had prompted this appeal to him, but it startled the Calcutta 'Statesman,' which on July 8, 1940, called it 'an astonishing revelation.'

---

\* 'The Times,' July 4. His portfolio was clearly defined.

† Quarterly for January 1941, p. 28.

In an article headed 'Can he mean it?' the editor asked what was the point of demanding independence from Britain in order to yield it to Hitler? None was visible unless it was 'to hamper Britain's war effort and India's war effort, in other words, to assist the enemy.'

'We can,' he wrote, 'find no sane basis of reasoning anywhere in the tangle of inconsistencies that Mr Gandhi puts forth week by week. . . . The youth of the country are not interested in this pale pacifism. . . . They have had enough of this business of non-violence and perpetual nursing of a grudge, which is what non-violent non-cooperation really means, however much it may be trimmed with talk about love. They want to look the world in the face, build up industries, have their own flyers and their own ships. They are looking for leadership in *these* things.'

I have traced\* the subsequent course of events, the Declaration of August 8, 1940, and Gandhi's initiation of his 'individual civil disobedience' campaign.

Writing from Vienna in 1934 Gandhi's rival Bose had published 'The Indian Struggle,' which applauded Gandhi for having converted the Congress from 'a talking body into a living and fighting organisation,' but rebuked him because his

'conscious or unconscious influence had caused certain traits to grow prominent again in Indian character, the inordinate belief in fate and the supernatural, the indifference to modern scientific development, the backwardness in the science of modern warfare, the peaceful contentment engendered by the latterday (Hindu) philosophy and adherence to "ahimsa" (non-violence).'†

This was clearly a threat to the Mahatma's supremacy. Bose had returned later to India, again become prominent in Congress councils, and was re-elected President in 1938, but found his position intolerable as Gandhi, walking delicately, would not allow him to choose a working committee of his own.‡ Bose started a 'Forward Bloc,' and eventually found his way to Berlin, where he now broadcasts for Goebbels. The Forward Bloc has lately been suppressed by the Government. In his book, while frequently accusing the Government or the police of

---

\* In January and October 1941.

† Bose, pp. 133-4.

‡ 'Indian Empire Review,' August 1939.

'atrocities,' he incautiously admits that in Russia, Germany, or Italy the Mahatma's doctrine of non-violence would have led him to 'the cross or the mental hospital.' But to return to the present.

Gandhi has lately admitted that until Indians themselves 'solved the communal tangle, independence was impossible.' He now wrote in his paper that he gave to his countrymen the same advice as that which he had given to Britishers in July 1940. But afterwards he managed to talk over Nehru, and declared on May 29 that many plans were floating in his brain and he was allowing them to float. The first task was to educate the public mind of India and world opinion, in so far as he was allowed to do so, and when he had finished that process to his satisfaction he might have to do something which 'might be very big if the Congress and people were with him.' He wanted to carry *them*, for his conception of freedom was no narrow conception, but 'coextensive with the freedom of man in all his majesty.' Meantime, however, he apparently nursed his 'army' and with his small clique eventually produced a Resolution which in its final form was to be laid before the larger Congress Committee on August 7. It endeavoured to justify Congress policy; and one passage may be quoted as a sample:

'The abortive Cripps proposals showed in the clearest possible manner that there was no change in the British Government's attitude to India and that the British hold on India was in no way to be relaxed. In their negotiations with Sir Stafford Cripps the Congress representatives tried their utmost to achieve the minimum consistent with the national demand, but it was of no avail. This frustration resulted in a rapid and widespread increase of ill-will against Britain and a growing satisfaction at the success of Japanese arms. The Working Committee saw this development with grave apprehension, as this, unless checked, will inevitably lead to the passive acceptance of aggression.' \*

'The Indian Social Reformer,' a paper influential in Congress circles, justly denounced this passage as 'a piece of political jugglery unworthy of any men with a claim to leadership.' The Resolution ended with the

---

\* 'The Times,' July 16.



threat that if its appeal for the withdrawal of British rule failed, the Congress would reluctantly be compelled to utilise all the 'non-violent' strength it had gathered since 1920. 'Such a widespread struggle would inevitably be under the leadership of Mr Gandhi.' They were 'agreeable' to the stationing of the armed forces of the Allies in India in order to ward off and resist Japanese or other aggression and to protect and help China. They wished to take no hasty step and to avoid, as far as possible, any course of action that might embarrass the United Nations. They claimed to have done their utmost to bring about a solution of the communal tangle. But this had been made impossible by the presence of a foreign Power.

This last claim was forthwith countered by the President of the Muslim League and stigmatised as 'a brazen falsehood.'\* It was, he said, for effort in this direction that one member, Mr Rajagopalachari, had been hounded out of the Congress Organisation.\* The League's weekly paper denounced the Resolution as 'a challenge to the British Government, the U.S.A., and all other parties in India.' 'The Times' of July 31 informs us that Mr Gandhi has addressed a letter to the Japanese telling them that the Congress Party is engaged in a 'deadly but friendly' quarrel with the British, but is opposed to all imperialist and militarist ambition, whether British, Japanese, or Nazi,' and so on for about two thousand words, 'from your friend and well-wisher, M. K. Gandhi.'

From 'The Times' of August 5 it appears that the Resolution of July had been founded on a draft prepared by Gandhi which was seized with other papers in a raid by the police on the Congress offices at Allahabad and plainly asserted that Britain was incapable of defending India, and that if India were 'freed' her first step would probably be to negotiate with Japan. The Congress Committee desired to assure the Japanese that India bore no enmity towards Japan and only desired freedom from alien domination.

Notes from the Working Committee's discussions which were seized with Gandhi's draft show that Nehru had

---

\* 'Sunday Times,' July 19.

observed that 'the whole background of the draft would inevitably make the whole world think that we are lining up with the Axis Powers.' Yet he concurred in the final draft, which was passed by the larger Congress Committee on the night of August 8. Some amendments had been proposed, all of which were withdrawn or voted down. Sir Stafford Cripps had made an unanswerable statement on August 5,\* pointing out the complete unreason and impossibility of Mr Gandhi's demands. Soon after their adoption by the Congress Committee, who had called for the immediate withdrawal of British power and sanctioned civil disobedience, Gandhi, Nehru, and other leaders were arrested and have since been detained in custody. On the night of the 9th Mr Amery broadcast to the Empire, saying that by their prompt and resolute action the Government of India had saved India and the Allied cause from grave disaster. Active preparation had for some time been in progress for the fomenting of strikes, not only in industry and commerce but in the administration and in the courts, schools, and colleges, for the interruption of traffic and public utility services, the cutting of telegraphs and telephone wires, the picketing of troops and recruiting services, all to be done 'non-violently.' But *bitter experience had shown* how easily the non-violent activities of excited crowds could lead to terrorism, riots, and bloodshed. The success of the proposed campaign would paralyse not only the ordinary civil administration of India but the whole war effort. It would stop the output of munitions, the construction of aerodromes, and above all shelters from air attack; it would put an end to recruiting; it would immobilise the forces. No worse stab in the back could be devised to all the gallant men, Indian or British, American or Chinese now engaged on Indian soil in the task of defending India herself and of preparing from India as their base to strike at the enemy. 'Firm and swift action,' he said, was necessary. But although there was abundant ground for punitive action, the Government of India had confined itself to essentially preventive action. They had disconnected Mr Gandhi and his confederates, had cut off the fuse leading from the arch-saboteurs to all

---

\* 'The Times,' August 6.

the inflammable and explosive material which they hoped to set alight all over India.

On the same day Mr Jinnah, as President of the Muslim League, regretted that Congress had launched a most dangerous mass movement in spite of warnings and advice, and warned its members that any attempt to force Muslims to take part in their movement would lead to the gravest situation. The Muslim attitude would be defined at a meeting of the League to be held shortly. He has been reported to express the opinion that Hindus and Muslims 'cannot live together and will never agree.' But I remember the time when, as a rule, they agreed well enough. Then the 'pax Britannica' seemed stable and the later intense competition for power between the communities was yet to come. The present dangerous situation has been vividly described by 'The Times' correspondent in India, whose words, dated August 18, must be quoted :

'Fears of the Future.—Indian comment on the disturbances contains more in the way of appeals to the Government to negotiate with Mr Gandhi than support for the suppression of disorder. That, of course, is according to form. Even those political elements which are against the "quit India" resolution of the Congress Party are prepared to take political advantage of the troubles to which it has given rise. There is, however, another element in the situation. There are few Indians who do not expect that when once the present trouble is over the Government of India will be found again negotiating with Congress; and that Congress will in the end be the winning party.

'Support for that view is found in quotations from some sections of the British Press which are being given great publicity in India. In these circumstances, relatively few Indians are prepared to compromise themselves in the eyes of Congress by definitely taking their stand on the side of the Government, or to expose themselves to future revenge on the part of Congress by accepting responsibility for anti-Congress actions now.'

The loyal and stout-hearted must be strongly reassured. The 'deadly but friendly' strategy of Mr Gandhi and his intimates now lies open for all to see.\*

VERNEY LOVETT.

---

\* See 'The Times,' August 29, 1942.

## Art. 2.—WHITHER ?

1. *The Lost Peace*. By Harold Butler. Faber and Faber, 1941.
2. *Saint George or the Dragon*. By Lord Elton. Collins, 1942.
3. *Mission to Moscow*. By Joseph E. Davies. United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union 1936-1938. Gollancz, 1942.
4. *Conditions of Peace*. By E. H. Carr. Macmillan, 1942.
5. *Federalism and Freedom*. By Sir George Young. Oxford University Press, 1941.
6. *The Price of Leadership*. By J. Middleton Murry. Student Christian Movement Press, 1939.
7. *Facing the Future*. By Lord Davies. Staple and Staple, 1942.

'THE tents have been struck and the great caravan of humanity is once more on the march.' Field-Marshal Smuts's characteristic aphorism was proclaimed at the close of the Four Years' War. 'On the march'; but whither? That is the question of supreme importance. Yet it is frequently ignored, as though it mattered little whether man was marching in the dark towards an abyss, or towards a refuge administered in a spirit which, though sympathetic, should be controlled by sanity and common sense. Mere movement and persistent restlessness do not necessarily mean 'Progress,' though they are constantly mistaken for it. Lord Elton has lately pointed out in a book remarkable for sound sense, clear thinking, and profound spiritual insight, that there is 'too much disposition to assume the inevitability of an unreflecting quantitative progress towards undefined goals.' 'Saint George or the Dragon' is in effect a sermon, and, like all well-arranged sermons, is preached on a text or series of texts. The two most suggestive are taken respectively from Milton's 'Paradise Lost' and Burke's 'Reflections on the French Revolution.'

'When the scourge inexorable, and the torturing hour calls us to penance.' So Milton. And Burke: 'He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our will. Our antagonist is our helper.' Lord Elton cordially concurs. He neither expects, nor seemingly

desires the abolition of war. Blind, brutal, and destructive though it be, war 'remains the final arbiter, the one test mankind has yet contrived of a nations' fitness to survive.' However much we may hate it, war 'is still the supreme agent of the evolutionary process.' Nay, more. 'The school of adversity has not seldom proved a nursery of the sterner virtues. And the doctrine of regeneration through suffering has been cherished in all ages by the most spiritually advanced among mankind. For us, therefore, the supreme purpose and meaning of this war must be that we are offered an opportunity of becoming worthy of victory in it.' For a long time past, led by prophets in wolves clothing, we have been worshipping false gods, and in particular, the god of naked materialism and mere intellectualism divorced from character. Incidentally, Lord Elton insists on the importance of something beyond 'book digestion' as an examination test. To the fact that our higher Civil Servants, to whose industry, capability, conscientiousness, and incorruptibility he, nevertheless, pays a high tribute, are selected solely by a scholastic examination he mainly attributes their lack of 'judgment and initiative.' He also points, justifiably, to the success of the Rhodes Scholars at Oxford, in whose selection purely scholastic attainments supply only one of several tests of ability, but who, nevertheless, have gained, he says, a larger proportion of 'Firsts' than the scholars from English schools.

But this is by the way. The essential purpose of 'Saint George or The Dragon' is to call the people of this land to repentance. We have been too prone to imagine that the goal of 'progress' is a 'higher standard of living' whereas it should be a higher standard of life. Democracy ought to aim at making men not merely more comfortable but better citizens. 'We must not hope for victory unless we have deserved it. And we shall not deserve it unless we become actually the better for fighting, braced and buffeted into our truer selves.'

Lord Elton's book is, then, a wholesome corrective to much that has been written and said about the millennium, mainly material, that awaits us when we have won the war and concluded a peace that shall be both just and lasting. To a chorus of hopeful anticipation, ever growing in volume, all sorts of people have con-



tributed, not merely professors, politicians, and journalists, but ecclesiastics, exalted and humble, who might perhaps be more appropriately and usefully employed in the supervision of their dioceses and in feeding their flocks.

The list of books prefixed to this article represents only a few of the more important works evoked by recent events, but they are mostly concurrent in tendency. Mr Harold Butler's 'The Lost Peace' is a conspicuously sound piece of work, the fruit of long years of service in the International Labour Office at Geneva, of extended travel, and of intercourse with statesmen and leaders of opinion in many lands. His careful retrospect of the recent past leads Mr Butler to several important conclusions: firstly, that the youth of most countries, despairing of reform through the machinery of existing institutions, political and social, is 'looking for some new thing'; secondly, that no democratic constitution however wisely devised, 'will live unless it rests on the basis of economic social security.' The 'major problem' is to find the type of democracy suited to different national temperaments and circumstances. Nothing can be more fatal than political imitation even if the model is provided by the English type of Parliamentary Democracy. Nor should the process of reconstruction, as it was in 1919, be hurried.

Isolationism, political or economic, is in Mr Butler's judgment dead: 'Some new form of international organisation is indispensable if war is really to be banished,' but the world will still continue to be organised in a number of separate nations: 'the national ideal is still the source from which the vitality, the culture, and rich diversity of our civilisation will be drawn.' 'Federal Union may come; but it is a long way off. . . . Even a partial federation of Europe is beyond the horizon of practical politics.' Yet we must anticipate a severe economic crisis when hostilities cease, and the new machinery devised to meet it may well 'become the embryo of a new economic Society of nations.' For new machinery there must be. 'The production and distribution of foodstuffs and raw materials, the allocation of shipping, and the regulation of credit and currencies will inevitably demand a large measure of planning and organisation on an international basis during the early

post-war years.' Only Great Britain and the United States can provide it. In this cooperative effort Australia and Canada might be invaluable intermediaries: 'They understand the temperament of Britain better than the average American, and the temperament of America better than the average Englishman.'

In deprecating haste in the formation of a Federal Union Mr Butler is at one with Lord Elton, who also thinks it may come if it is not hurried, and if it is built up round the core of the British Commonwealth. There is, he adds, 'no need for it to spring ready armed like Minerva from the brow of Jove or the League of Nations from that of President Wilson.' Mr Carr's attitude towards Federal Union is even less enthusiastic than that of Lord Elton and Mr Butler. He argues that 'to begin with constitutional structures is to begin at the wrong end,' that the hope of the future depends on 'practical issues of cooperation and interdependence, military and economic.'

The question 'Whither?' would seem then to raise two problems: the one primarily political or constitutional, the other economic and social. To these two problems many people would add a third—religious and ethical, maintaining that the third embraces the other two, which cannot be solved save by a fundamental change of heart, or in religious terminology by 'repentance.' 'Repentance,' is indeed, the main thesis of Lord Elton's book. 'We have,' he says with emphasis, 'erected a civilisation rich in means, but almost destitute of ends. We have been seeking some form of outer order, without having achieved inner order.' The answer to the challenge of Nazidom, 'seems likely,' he maintains, 'to depend upon whether or not we achieve regeneration through suffering, and in the course of the struggle conquer not only the enemy but ourselves. . . . It is for national regeneration, moral and spiritual, that we must look now, if we would survive.' Field-Marshal Smuts has reached a similar conclusion. 'Fundamentally,' he said not long ago, 'the world has need only of the honest and courageous application of the historical Christian idea.' That is also, and even more directly and exclusively, the theme of Mr J. Middleton Murry's 'The Price of Leadership.' The English State and the type of

Society represented by England are, he argues, doomed unless we can realise in practice the 'Kingdom of God.' England, though nominally a Christian nation, is a 'Christian nation that has lost the Key of its own nature, and secularised its own principles so that they have ceased to be dynamic.'

To Mr Murry the enemy to be destroyed is nationalism. 'Nationalism,' he says, 'has devoured the heart of Christianity: only a shell remains.' That is evidently an extravagant assertion, not substantiated by an appeal to the history of the development of the national sentiment. The accusation commonly made, until quite recently, against the diplomatists responsible for the Peace Settlement of 1815 was that they had neutralised the most vital and beneficent of the forces unleashed in the French Revolution; that heeding only the wishes of autocrats and the claims of dynasties, they had neglected the interests and ignored the sentiments of the peoples immediately affected by territorial readjustments; that they had repressed liberty; above all, that they had contemned the emergent spirit of nationality. Of early Victorian Liberalism no one is more representative than John Stuart Mill, who wrote: 'It is in general,' he wrote, 'a necessary condition of free institutions that the boundaries of governments should coincide in the main with those of nationalities.' In short, Nationalism was regarded as the compliment of Liberty.

What was the result of this convergent criticism of the Viennese diplomatists upon the peace-makers of 1919? One and all they went to Paris resolved not to repeat the blunder of 1815, but to give full effect to the principle of 'self-determination.' Thus, nationalism was accepted as a keynote of the Treaty of Versailles.

And to-day? Who so poor as to do 'nationalism' reverence? Mill, with most of his contemporaries, is intellectually *démodé*. The wheel has now gone nearly full circle. But not quite. Thus, with all his devotion to the principles of the League of Nations, Mr Butler can write:

'The world will still continue to be organised in a number of separate nations. . . . To suppose that nations which have made unprecedented sacrifices in order to preserve their national identity are going to surrender it once they

have regained it is surely contrary to common sense. To recover their national lives will be the first and dearest wish of all of them, even the smallest, and their right to do so is implicit in the conception of democracy. *The national ideal* is still the source from which the vitality, the culture, and the rich diversity of our civilisation will be drawn.'

A student group of members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, who in 1939 published a closely reasoned and severely philosophical Report on 'Nationalism,' reached a similar conclusion. Nationalism, they held, is not likely to be superseded either by the intensification of class solidarity between the nationals of different countries, or by such a circumscription of national sovereignty as any federal scheme must necessarily involve.

Nevertheless Federation is the goal at which many people are at the moment aiming. A federal union provides, in their judgment, the only solution of the problem presented by the existing chaos in international relations. Definite schemes have been drafted which though generally concurrent naturally exhibit great variety in details. Take, for instance, the question as to the component States of the Federation: shall it be confined to Democratic States, or shall autocracies be invited or permitted to adhere to it? Shall it be confined to Europe, and to the Dependencies or Dominions of European Powers? Should the United States be included? Or the South American Republics? Or China, India, and a chastened Japan? Again, there is a question as to the organs of the Federal Government. Shall the Executive be based on the Parliamentary or the Presidential model? Again, as to the division of functions between the Central (Federal) and Local (State) Governments: shall the residue of functions be vested, as in the United States, in the States or in the Federation, or, following the example of the Dominion of Canada, shall the Provinces (or States) exercise only such functions as are specifically delegated to them? \*

These and like matters are evidently what Cromwell would have described as *Circumstantialis*. On them there

---

\* On the difficulties which in Canada and Australia have arisen in this connection see my article in 'Quarterly Review,' No. 549 (July 1941).

may well be a difference of opinion. To *Fundamentals*, on the contrary, all types of Federalism must needs conform. Every variety of Federal Government necessarily involves: (i) some surrender of 'Sovereignty' on the part of the component States, or in defiance of Austin and his disciples, at the lowest a division of Sovereignty between the Central and Local Governments; (ii) a precise allocation of powers between the Federation and the Component States; (iii) a complete reduplication of the organs of government—executive, legislative, and judicial, and a precise definition of their respective functions; (iv) an *Instrument* or written Constitution in which these arrangements are embodied; (v) a special machinery for the revision of the terms of the *Instrument*, which being in the nature of an international Treaty can be revised only with the assent of all, or at least a great majority of the States concerned; and (vi) a body, presumably judicial in character, entrusted with authority to safeguard the constitution, and competent to interpret its terms.

Such are the problems which occupy the minds of those who regard a new form of international polity as the most urgent of the tasks awaiting the architects and builders of the 'New and Better World' in which Peace shall reign supreme.

The prevailing disposition is, however, to regard the political problem as secondary in time, if not in importance, and to concentrate immediate attention upon social and economic reconstruction. Even Mr Butler, although convinced that 'some new form of international organisation is indispensable,' holds that no political reconstruction should be attempted until 'the foundations of economic recovery have been laid.' Mr Carr is even more emphatic. We are to call into existence at the close of hostilities a 'European Planning Authority,' and 'European Reconstruction or Public Works Corporation,' not to mention several other European Commissions whose business it will be to work out the details of the New Order to which the whole of Europe must conform.

About one thing let there be no mistake. The 'New Order' to which Mr Carr looks forward with such eager anticipation is definitely socialistic. He holds that 'our economic system must reverse the whole trend of the

last century and a half, and once more subordinate the producer to the consumer ' whose demands are to be met by State subsidies :

' The opinion,' he writes, ' has gradually spread among responsible people in this country that the provision of cheap food, like the provision of cheap housing, to those who could not otherwise afford it is a proper charge on public funds. . . . The first call is naturally for the prime necessities of life—food, housing, clothing, and fuel. Provided we are prepared to accept the necessary discipline [by " discipline " I presume Mr Carr to mean the existing rates of income and super-tax, and death duties] there is no doubt that all these can be supplied without undue strain on our resources. But there is no reason in principle to limit ourselves to the bare minimum. It is not unreasonable to contemplate the eventual inclusion in our scheme of free electric cookers ; subsidised radio sets or cheap motor cars, of national theatres and concerts, of free holiday trips and so forth. . . . Once it is clearly established that the purpose of our economic system is to produce things wanted, directly or indirectly, for consumption, not things which it is profitable to produce, the limits of what is practicable in the way of achievement can in all probability be set fairly high ' (p. 138).

Incidentally we may ask how it can be profitable to produce anything which is not ' wanted, directly or indirectly for consumption.' But let that pass. There is more to come. The tax-payers of this country are, it seems, not merely to provide food, housing, clothing, and fuel to their own people but to the poverty-stricken countries of Europe. ' The raising of standards in these countries, as well as in Great Britain, even at the cost of some immediate sacrifice to ourselves should be one of our war aims and an essential part of our post-war policy. The problem of nutrition is preeminently one which calls for solution on something like a world-wide basis.'

Mr Carr's answer to the question ' Whither ? ' is then free from ambiguity. But if the goal can be clearly discerned the route by which it is to be reached is not. How a poverty-stricken Britain, taxed up to the hilt, and loaded with debt, is to discharge the vast responsibility which Mr Carr in his generosity towards our neighbours would impose upon us remains obscure.

The debt question does not, however, greatly trouble our light-hearted idealists. Thus Sir George Young writes ('Federation and Freedom,' p. 103): 'As it will be in no one's interest to risk a social revolution by compliance with an impossible pecuniary obligation to the moneyed class, we shall, no doubt, repudiate our monetary liability in some decorous and indirect manner.' But who are the 'moneyed class'? Are the super-tax payers the only subscribers to War Loans? Are they the only creditors of the State? Does not Sir George Young ignore the splendid response of the small saver to Lord Kindersley's eloquent appeals? Does he not realise that the 'capitalist class' is to-day happily almost co-extensive with the adult population? As long ago as 1925 I collected and published statistics by which I claimed to prove that there were even then at least 15,000,000 capitalists in the United Kingdom, and that the aggregate amount of capital held in various forms by working-class investors was at least 2,500,000,000*l.* The only criticism I ever heard on my figures was that they represented an *understatement*! The diffusion of capital is to-day far wider than it was in 1925, and the proportion of it invested in Government Securities must now be much higher. Does Sir George Young suggest that 'in some decorous and indirect manner' these savings should be confiscated? If so, is it not his plain duty to prosecute the Chancellor of the Exchequer for issuing a series of fraudulent prospectuses? In the meantime we must hope that Sir George's views on repudiation will not command sufficient publicity to restrict the flow of savings small or large into the country's war chest.

Sir George Young has given expression to other views which tempt to comment almost as urgently as his views on the repudiation of the National Debt. With the iniquity of our propertied classes he is evidently obsessed, though what precisely he means by the following not untypical passage I am frankly at a loss to understand:

'European democracy and German democracy became two Babes that wandered in a Dark and Dismal Wood of Diplomacy until, deserted even by the Villain of milder mood, they died in each other's armaments. But this and other nursery tragedies are too recent to need recalling. What we must realise is that we British are to-day preparing to pursue



the same policy in respect of Prussia after the war that has now cost us two wars in one generation. For our ruling class is to-day planning to replace the gangster Government of Hitlerism by the *ancien régime* of a Prussian Reich and Reichswehr. The foolish fear of "red" revolution that has falsified our public opinion and foreign policy ever since the success of Soviet Socialism, and that has been fatal to so very many democracies indispensable to our international interests, is now frustrating our proper policy for the reconstruction of Germany by the restoration of German democracy' (p. 45).

It must be frankly admitted that there has been much in our conduct of foreign affairs since the Treaty of Versailles that in the light of recent events few of us who helped to sustain successive Administrations would now find it easy to defend. But, as I have attempted elsewhere to show,\* the Western Democracies had every ground for fearing the influence of Bolshevism during the early twenties, at the time when Trotsky was preaching the gospel of World-Revolution, and both in England and France there was a considerable party who were prepared to listen to the voice of the Siren. Not, indeed, until after the fiasco of the General Strike was the faction in favour of 'Direct Action' discredited: not until after Stalin's decisive victory over Trotsky, Zinovieff, Kamenaff, and other leaders of the Third International, was the fear of a World-Revolution inspired by Russia finally dispelled.

That suspicion of Russian policy should not have died down immediately after Stalin's accession to power should surely cause no surprise. Not, be it remembered, until 1933 did the United States accord diplomatic recognition to the U.S.S.R.; not until 1934 was Russia admitted to the League of Nations. Coinciding, as these events did, with Hitler's advent to power we ought perhaps to have begun to perceive that we were putting our money on the wrong horse, and that by alliance with Russia we might have averted the disasters that followed in quick succession—the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, the rape of Austria, and the treacherous assault of Nazi Germany upon Czecho-Slovakia. But it is easy to be wise after the event, and not even our tardy recog-

---

\* 'The Tragedy of Europe.' (Blackie and Sons, 1941), chaps. III-V.

nition of the real trend of Russian policy can justify Sir George Young's bitter and biased indictment of the 'propertied classes' of this country.

At the moment the attack of the Socialists, especially the 'Christian Socialists,' is concentrated upon the 'profit motive' in industry. That is evidently the most flaming of the red rags which to-day attracts the attention of socialist reformers and supplies by implication the answer they would give to the question 'Whither?' 'The predominance of the profit-motive in industry offends against Christian principles.' Such was the first of the dogmatic propositions announced by the Conference which in January 1941 met at Malvern under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The second declared that the profit-motive 'becomes a source of unemployment and has been a predisposing cause of war.' Incidentally we may ask how the motive of private profit could have predisposed to war a Germany committed in practice to State Socialism? But that question must not divert us from the main issue. 'Interest' or 'usury' was the special object of denunciation by the medieval Church; the modern Church, or a section of it, while tolerating interest, would abolish profits. Both 'interest' and 'profits' are, however, equally essential attributes of what it has become fashionable to decry as the 'capitalist system'—in other words, the whole elaborate, and on the whole beneficent, structure of modern industry. The nature and functions of 'interest' and 'profits' must not, however, be confused. 'Interest' is the remuneration of capital lent upon presumably reasonable security, and generally at a very moderate rate. 'Profits' sometimes includes interest (and sometimes even rent as well), but ought strictly to be differentiated as the remuneration of ability and an insurance for risk. Unless risks are taken there can be no progress in industry. Those who take risks are entitled to remuneration. Public bodies are not entitled to take 'risks' at the expense of the tax-payer; and as a rule they rightly play for safety. In private enterprise, on the contrary, an element of risk is a condition of success, and success is measured by 'profits.' But that does not mean that 'profits' are the exclusive or even the predominant *motive* in industry. The fact that teachers, in their conferences, spend much

of their time in discussing salary scales is no indication that they think of nothing else. Because trade unions are largely concerned with wages it would be a libel upon British workmen to suggest that they take no pride in their work. The machine has by no means eliminated the necessity for skill, and good workmen are still anxious to turn out work that shall be a credit to them.

Similarly, although high profits reward the skill of the sagacious *entrepreneur*, profits are in no sense the end-all of his business activity. Profits are significant as a measure of success; success offers opportunities for service to the community, and those opportunities are more often taken than the captious critic allows, or mayhap knows.

Two further fallacies should in this connection be exposed. Profits, according to the best modern economists, are neither an addition to price nor a deduction from wages. The ill-managed concern which earns no profits is apt to pay lower wages and to charge for its products higher prices than the concern which pays satisfactory and even exceptionally high dividends. Thus business experience confirms the truth of economic theory. It should also confound the doctrinaire Socialist. High profit-making concerns so far from being, as the Malvern moralists aver, 'a source of unemployment' extend the area of employment. Lord Nuffield may have disturbed the academic calm of Oxford (a crime for which he has striven to make magnificent amends), but who would suggest that the success of Morris Motors, Ltd. has been a 'source of unemployment'? The concern yields high profits to the ordinary shareholders; are its wages lower or its prices higher than the wages and prices of less successful competitors?

Not all reformers are, however, indiscriminating in their attack upon the profit-motive. Mr Carr, for instance, finds it possible to conceive for the future a mixed economy in which government control and private enterprise should operate side by side each in its appropriate sphere. Sir William Beveridge, an ardent advocate of a State-planned economy, at the close of an address to the Engineering Industries Association (July 30) was asked how he would deal with the youths who refused to enter certain occupations. He is reported to have answered: 'Adjust the terms of remuneration, make the occupation

attractive. You will have to use the *economic motive* (the italics are mine) to get people from one occupation to another.' What could better illustrate the legitimate operation of the economic motive in industry, whether it inspires the employed or the employer ?

Nevertheless, it would be futile and even dangerous to ignore the influence which mere catchwords exercise upon popular (and largely unreasoning) opinion. 'Production should be for use not for profit.' 'Service not money making should be the motive of industry.' 'The banks are the citadels of capitalism, and should be nationalised.' 'The root of all evil is "bank-made" money.' 'Cooperation should replace competition.' 'The mines for the miners'—these are the catch-words repeated *ad nauseam*, and calculated by the mere force of iteration to beguile the unwary. Especially are they apt to impress when they are repeated from the pulpit with the authority of the Church, and postulated as an article of Christian ethics. The rôle of the economic expert is in truth much too confidently and carelessly assumed. Professor Schacht, discussing the multiplication of retail shops, has lately denounced this assumption in an article, whose wit failed to conceal its wisdom. Of the twenty million adults in this country nineteen million he declared 'are ready to pronounce upon economic problems at any time of the day or night. Talk about the indiscriminate opening of shops: it is nothing to the indiscriminate opening of mouths on this highly expert science.' \*

That is truly, if satirically, said. But there is something worse than mere verbosity. Without any lapse of charity it is difficult to resist the suspicion that many popular prophets are deliberately exploiting the natural aspiration for a 'new and a better world,' in order to hasten the adoption of their own economic prescriptions. As Lord Elton has well put it: 'The New Social Orderers . . . proposed in fact to indulge in a peculiar form of war-profiteering by using Armageddon as a sort of smoke-screen for the advance of their own favourite theories.'

During the Revolution of 1848 Louis Blanc and the French Socialists, trusting in the panacea of 'National Workshops,' held out to the people hopes incapable of

---

\* 'The Spectator,' July 31, 1942.

fulfilment. Their extravagant promises evoked a protest from M. Thiers, one of the sanest of French statesmen : ' To promise what is impossible is to deceive the people.' Those who now promise a post-war millennium should heed this warning. If challenged by the question ' Whither ? ' their reply is unequivocal : ' Nationalisation ' is the panacea for all the economic and social diseases from which we suffer. Begin by nationalising the banks and the utility services : water, gas, electricity, transport, and so forth. Then proceed to all the instruments of production, distribution, and exchange : land, coal, capital, retail shops, and foreign trade. So will poverty and unemployment be eliminated : none will be rich ; none will be poor.

But can the question ' Whither ? ' in truth be answered by facile promises, or disposed of by roseate dreams ? The application of economic *maxims* may depend on varying circumstances. Economic *laws*, on the contrary, stand immutable. The wages of sin against the moral law is death. Persistent transgression of economic law must needs be visited by penalties equally inescapable.

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

### Art. 3.—DIVORCE IN THE POST-WAR WORLD.

THOSE whose minds are free to ponder at times on problems of post-war social, as distinct from political, reforms would do well to give some attention to the apparently everlasting subject of divorce. This is all the more desirable because war conditions intensify the need for satisfactory laws and legal machinery that deal with marriages that fail. In times of war circumstances are apt to encourage the contracting of hasty marriages, marriages in which after a few years, occasionally a few months, there appear signs of severe strain. Some in the fighting services are perhaps unduly conscious of the fact that separation allowances will be available for wife and children; also that marriage licences are temptingly cheap for them. Many of those making munitions are earning comparatively so much money that there seems little sense in looking ahead. We magistrates have experience of applications by those who are legal minors, but military adults, to permit marriage despite parental refusal. Sometimes the desire to marry appears to be prompted by the charms of separation allowances rather than by any lasting appreciation of the charms of the other party. There is general agreement that war conditions have an unsettling influence on countless marriages, even when marriages took place in times of peace.

Many think that the problem of divorce was finally disposed of by the Act of 1937 which resulted from the parliamentary labours of Lord Buckmaster, Mr Holford Knight, and Mr A. P. Herbert. On the contrary, this Act was but the most recent stone placed on a building, mostly erected by private Members of Parliament, that from the beginning in 1857 had very inadequate foundations; there is some reason to fear that this last stone has made the whole building a dangerous structure. Among problems of post-war reconstruction a new Matrimonial Causes Act will be an urgent need.

For a century at least religious organisations have argued whether full divorce, giving a legal right to re-marry, is or is not permissible according to Biblical teaching. In one form or another, sometimes in the form of decrees of nullity, a safety valve has always existed

among Christians for some of those whose marriage was a failure and who wished to marry again. Instead of labouring to make this safety valve as safe as possible for Christianity, religious organisations—ignoring the truth so well expressed by Dr F. R. Barry, now Bishop of Southwell, that the New Testament 'is not concerned with life in its detail, but with life in its core of worth and significance,'\*—have mostly concentrated on exegetic disputation. They did so in 1857 when Parliament for the first time passed a law enabling full divorce to be granted by the courts of law. They have done so ever since. The result is that the divorce law of to-day is founded upon the theological scholarship of a century ago. Although theologians of modern times do not all take the same view of the true meaning of Christ's words, as recorded in the Gospels, it is still generally believed by most of them that divorce for adultery (apart from the question of remarriage) has the highest sanction known to Christians. The evils that have followed the acceptance by the law of this view in 1857 and ever since are vastly greater than those created by the Buckmaster-Holford Knight-Herbert additions to the grounds for divorce.

Because the word 'fornication' in our Bible has been accepted to mean adultery, neither ecclesiastical nor legal opinion has troubled itself with doubts about accepting proof of adultery as adequate. Provided that adultery could be proved in court, and in the same way that people prove their claims for damages, their contracts, and their torts, all was considered for the best in a Christian country. Thus divorce cases came to be tried in the same way as other actions in the courts and it was assumed that Biblical teaching was being followed. But if it had been generally realised that the New Testament is the source for inspiration about 'life in its core of worth and significance,' not for sections in Acts of Parliament, then ecclesiastical influence would have been directed, and would be directed now, to establishing safeguards to minimise the dangers of divorce.

For a long time the narrow religious views upon which the divorce laws were founded mattered little. After 1857 the annual number of divorce decrees was for many

---

\* 'The Relevance of Christianity,' p. 57.



years about 200. In the last years of the last century the annual number was only about 500. In 1932 there were nearly 4,000 decrees, largely due to the fact that the theology of 1857 was again accepted in 1923, with the result that with much ecclesiastical approval women were permitted to divorce their husbands by proving adultery alone. In the last statistical year before the war (1938) there were 6,092 decrees absolute, nearly half of which were the result of petitions by wives. Whether the extensions of the grounds for divorce made in 1937 have been responsible for much of the later increases cannot be proved.

Had religious opinion sought to apply the teaching of the New Testament about 'life in its core of worth and significance,' surely in all this divorce legislation the main demand of all churches would have been for safeguards to make divorce safe, or at least not the blatant evil that it is to-day. Christians who concentrate upon the spirit of Christ's teaching rather than on the letter would surely have insisted long ago that the law should recognise a big difference between divorce cases where there are dependent children and divorce cases where either there are no children or where the children have grown up. But this difference, so obvious and so Christian, has never been made and there is no ecclesiastical demand for it to-day. Happily the science of modern psychology has stepped in where the Christian churches have failed to tread.

Authorities in modern psychology, Freudian, Adlerian, Jungian, etc., are unanimous on few points, but they are agreed that discord between parents results in grave dangers for their children. Where parents are living together and with their children, but are quarrelling and producing an atmosphere of hostility in the home, the consequences to the children may be serious, varying from bad work in school to delinquency, either in the home or outside. Such a home situation exposes the children to mental conflicts and anxieties which can have a big effect on character development. The evolution from childish egotism becomes difficult. The feeling of security so essential to growth may be undermined. The whole style of life, the main features of which are fixed at the age of about seven, may be adversely affected. A small proportion of children brought up by warring parents are able to compensate for this disadvantage and even to benefit

from what Dr William Healy well termed emotional undernourishment. Other children benefit in a dangerous way by taking sides (not consistently the same side in some cases) and drawing material benefits from their support. But the majority of such children suffer both consciously and, more important, unconsciously. Countless authorities could be quoted in support of this view.\*

When parents separate in consequence of their quarrels, the outlook for their children may be improved, but more often it is made worse. Where there is cruelty involving the children, even as spectators, separation is probably the wisest course; but sometimes the disputes between the parents do not involve the children, even making allowance for the fact that the modern child is likely to observe parental discord more readily than did Victorian children. Separation creates grave problems for children, problems which modern psychology has shown to be much more serious than may appear on the surface. Young children of separated parents usually remain in the custody of the mother, and only too frequently is the mother's influence used to the detriment of the father's reputation. But modern psychology teaches that a child's 'feeling about the father' is the basis of his 'unconscious attitude towards all authority and law.'† An absent father can be a force in the psychological development of his child just as much as can a father living with his family. During this war it has been said over and over again by experienced people that the absence of the fathers on war service has been a potent factor in the considerable increase of juvenile delinquency. War demands this price. But a similar demand is made by separation and divorce. This is a factor which most quarrelling parents, in my experience, have failed to consider.

When legislation about divorce has been planned in the past, there has been no consideration for this important factor. The object of attention has consistently been the supposed rights of the partners to marriages that have failed. The consequences to children of divorce have been

---

\* E.g. the books by Professor Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Drs Healy and Bronner, all of Boston, U.S.A.; 'The Challenge of Childhood,' by Dr Ira Wile of New York; 'The Young Delinquent,' by Dr Cyril Burt.

† 'Motives and Mechanisms of the Mind,' by Dr E. Graham Howe, pp. 98 and 117.

considered solely from the points of view of legal custody and financial responsibility. Even churches did not urge that the interests of children should have prior consideration to those of their parents. Public opinion, the legal profession, and ecclesiastical opinion, in so far as it accepted full divorce, all agreed that divorce was a question of adult right and that disputes must be settled according to general legal methods. The first breach in this latter assumption came in 1926 when Parliament passed a private member's bill to restrict the right of the press to report divorce cases. This was an admission that divorce cases have more in them than the rights of the parties. The general public interest is involved. In the High Court this has been one of the very few procedural changes since 1857; in general our historic legal procedure has been retained for matrimonial disputes. There is irony in the fact that in 1895 the commercial world revolted against the unduly formal, expensive, and dilatory procedure of common law trial with the result that the High Court judges voluntarily prepared a new scheme for commercial cases. But husbands and wives could not bring their legal grievances forward and nobody agitated on their behalf. In 1937 came a substantial change, but it did not affect the High Court. Until that year historic common law procedure existed also in matrimonial disputes in Magistrates' Courts, where most disputes, short of full divorce, could be decided for those who were content with an order of 2*l.* a week for a wife and ten shillings for each child. The Summary Procedure (Domestic Proceedings) Act, 1937, modified conventional legal procedure in many important ways. Matrimonial work now has to be separated from the ordinary work of Magistrates' Courts, only three magistrates can be present when matrimonial work is being done, admission to domestic courts is closely controlled and similar restrictions are placed on the reporting of separation cases as were made for divorce cases in 1926. It was also recognised that social workers (probation officers) can, if the parties desire, perform valuable functions in matrimonial cases. These were useful steps forward. But for the war, some demand would probably have been made that the procedure for divorce cases should be modified on similar lines. For if modified court procedure and the services of social workers were found

necessary for the matrimonial work of Magistrates' Courts, where the matrimonial status of the parties can never be affected, it might be expected that in the Divorce Court, where status can be altered, changes of a similar kind would be found desirable. No order made by a magisterial domestic court is necessarily final; the parties can annul it at any time by living together again. Orders of the Divorce Court are final if they take the form of decrees absolute for divorce. This contrast has become the more striking in recent years by reason of the development of the Poor Persons Rules in the Divorce Court; in very large numbers exactly the same type of matrimonial applicant known in magistrates' domestic courts now comes to the Divorce Court through the Poor Persons procedure. When, therefore, Mrs Jones wants a separation from her husband, and still remains his wife, both Mr and Mrs Jones, and the court as well, have the assistance of skilled social workers and the benefit of a humane and intelligent legal procedure. But when Mrs Jones wants a divorce, which is final, no social help is available and, save that the newspapers cannot report the case fully, the old-time legal procedure will be adopted.

In the last letter which he wrote to the press Sir Frederick Pollock, K.C., drew attention to the social nakedness of the Divorce Court:

'A court for matrimonial causes should have conciliation for its first object . . . and should be entrusted with wide discretion. It should have power to grant a final decree of divorce when, after full inquiry and consideration, reconciliation proves impracticable.

'When our Divorce Court was created, its method and procedure were modelled on those of our civil courts in matters of ordinary litigation. . . . The application of that scheme to family relations, and to marriage in particular, is in my humble opinion all wrong.' \*

This letter urged all that I have urged here. The Act of 1937, re-modelling the matrimonial work of Magistrates' Courts, was the first step to do what Sir Frederick Pollock wanted. Part of post-war reconstruction must be to achieve the rest. How far the present methods of the High Court are from the ideal of this great legal thinker

---

\* 'Daily Telegraph,' Nov. 14, 1936.

can best be seen when at assizes up and down the country High Court judges hear divorce cases. There the criminal work, the civil work, and the divorce work are done by the same judge in the same place at the same session and all by the same procedure. In each kind of case the function of the court is the same: the test is whether the prosecution, the plaintiff and the petitioner have proved their cases according to the laws of evidence. If a divorce case is legally proved, a decree nisi follows and at no stage is there any pause for social inquiry. While at assizes probation officers may be in attendance for the criminal cases, they are not employed to assist in matrimonial cases; such cases are merely combats between the parties and in a high percentage of the cases only one side is present in court. The issues to be tried in divorce, as in criminal and civil, cases have been narrowed down in written statements, so the hearing in court is shortened as much as possible; if the respondent in a divorce case does not appear, as often happens, the case will last about five minutes and that is all the judge sees of it. The real reasons why the marriage has failed are no concern of the judge, nor does he inquire whether the petitioner thoroughly understands the consequences of obtaining a decree. If magistrates had to handle their matrimonial work under such restricted conditions, a marriage case would be no more interesting than a case about a motorist accused of passing a traffic signal when the red light was showing. In fact many High Court judges have expressed in public strong opinions about their divorce work. In his attractive book 'On Circuit 1924-1937' Lord Justice Mackinnon wrote that 'the most trying days at Leeds were those on which I had to deal with about eighty undefended divorce cases. This is the only form of judicial work that I have always detested; and I have resented having to do it.' These cases were, wrote the learned judge, 'so repulsive and degrading a duty'; they 'would not tax the powers of the stupidest man who was ever an acting-deputy Registrar of a County Court.' Our late Lord Chief Justice, Lord Hewart, was even more caustic. After dealing with a number of undefended divorce cases at Lewes, he once said to one of the barristers present: 'Can you tell me why cases of this kind should not be tried in police courts, and if possible in batches?'

Such statements are painful when one realises that many of the parties before these learned judges probably had young children.

Without intending any disrespect to High Court judges I would urge that there must be something radically wrong with our judicial machinery for handling matrimonial disputes when such statements have to be made from those on the Bench. What is wrong is that such disputes are handled from the legal point of view only, and by the same methods as are used in a murder trial or a claim for damages in a motor-car accident. Magistrates often find matrimonial work depressing, for human nature is often exasperating. But I have never heard any magistrate, professional or lay, say that he 'detests' the work or finds it 'repulsive' or 'degrading.' Ever since in January 1935 I established a domestic court I have regarded the afternoon devoted each week to that work as the high spot of the week's work. But the reactions of the Bench are of less importance than the interests of the parties; and, I would add, the interests of the parties are of less importance than those of their minor children.

It is sometimes said that it is an insult to the intelligence of adults to assume that they do not know, when in matrimonial difficulty, what is best for them and for their children. Thus the anonymous and very critical author, signing himself 'Barrister,' of 'Justice in England' took exception to what he termed 'a kind of preliminary moral censorship.' He apparently objected to the whole conception that between the granting of legal process and the legal hearing parties to matrimonial disputes should be given an opportunity of talking over their difficulties in private with an experienced social worker. I agree that in the past there used to be in some courts a certain amount of moral coercion. Some magistrates were content to leave almost the whole of the cases with the social workers attached to their courts; even summonses were seldom granted until the parties had thrashed out their troubles privately. But in recent years this kind of extra-court settlement has been frowned on and the usual practice now is for the applicants to be granted their summonses by or on behalf of magistrates, so that the legal road is opened to them, and for probation



officers to proffer their help afterwards. The consequence is that it is rare for a case to be heard by the court without a preliminary canter in the probation officers' rooms; only a very small proportion of wives and husbands refuse to accept the probation officers' offer of help. Another consequence is that in a substantial number of cases in the magistrates' lists for hearing in domestic courts the parties do not attend, having already adjusted their differences. This, I would suggest, is true conciliation. It will be seen, therefore, that conciliation procedure does not mean that there is any barrier against the obtaining of legal rights. Magistrates often have to make separation orders when they are convinced that the parties and their children would all be better off if the differences were adjusted. If the parties insist, the law has to take its course. But where there is conciliation procedure the last question to be discussed is whether a party has a case that can be proved in court. Before coming to that question, all-important in litigation, the conciliator sees first that the parties fully understand the consequences of the step which they want the court to take. (I have had to deal with many women who have divorced their husbands without ever realising that his re-marriage would render unlikely in practice the continuation of their alimony. I have also had to deal with men who have successfully persuaded their wives to divorce them who have become indignant when I pointed out that they still remain financially responsible for their children.) The conciliator, acting only with the consent of the parties, tries to see whether they can be satisfied without resorting to litigation at all. It often happens that a wife will find her husband more tolerable when she realises the cost of two separate homes, or when the risks that the children will run are brought home to her. Hopes of conciliation are not abandoned even when the case comes into court, for by the wise provision of a section of an Act of 1925, magistrates in domestic courts can make interim orders, for periods up to three months, without determining the issue; during the interim period the social worker keeps in touch and without any coercion a high proportion of the cases so handled are in the end adjusted amicably. Sir Frederick Pollock urged that this power should also be given to the High Court, but it is difficult to see how



conciliation work could be done in the High Court, where traditions are essentially legal rather than social.

Experience has convinced me that the absence of social assistance for those seeking divorce constitutes a grave evil. Sometimes an unhappy wife or husband seeking divorce has obtained social help in my court although I have no powers in regard to divorce cases. But it so happens that 'poor persons' applicants come to magistrates in order to testify formally to the truth of the statements made by them on their forms of application; the magistrate is in effect a rubber stamp and no more. One of these was Mrs P. She had filled up her form for the Poor Persons Department and was embarking on the road leading to divorce. I glanced at the form, saw that there were young children and asked Mrs P. whether she had talked over this grave step with anyone. Mrs P. replied that she had talked the matter over with her husband; scarcely an impartial person. I offered the services of a probation officer and the offer was accepted eagerly. It appeared later that the husband had 'gone off' with another woman, that Mrs P. wanted him back, and that Mr P. had told his wife that he would maintain her and the children if she divorced him, but would give nothing if divorce was refused. So, believing this monstrous mis-statement of the situation, Mrs P. had set out for the High Court and if we had not butted in she would have got her divorce; there was a cast-iron legal case. But we acted on modern lines. The probation officer recommended Mrs P. to see me again. She duly appeared and I explained fully the difference between a divorce and a separation in my domestic court. I told her that she appeared to have a good case for adultery and that at any time I would sign her form if she wanted to proceed with her divorce case. Mrs P. opted for a summons. So, as I had gone rather far into the affair of Mrs. P, I issued a summons for desertion and, not at her request, placed the summons in the list of my colleague. A fortnight later I discovered that my colleague had marked in his court list 'Withdrawn' against the name of P. v. P. So I asked the probation officer to tell me all about it. I learned that Mr P. had quickly responded when the probation officer wrote to him. At a talk Mr P. indicated in manner rather than in words that he would like to be forgiven, so

the probation officer had gradually brought about a reconciliation. Two years afterwards Mr and Mrs P. and their children were living happily together. But if Mrs P. had proceeded to the Poor Persons Department she would have had solicitor and counsel assigned to her, both of whom would, according to professional etiquette, have kept the parties apart; Mrs P. would have been before a High Court judge for at most five minutes and another divorce would have been added to the ever increasing thousands. Another similar case was more difficult. After hearing the evidence of the parties I formed the opinion that the husband's conduct came within the legal definitions of 'persistently cruel,' and that the wife appeared antagonistic to him. Nevertheless I felt that the parties had not yet reached finality, and in this I was supported by the probation officer, who had seen the parties in private between the issue and the hearing of the summons. There was some response to my suggestions that separation would involve hardship upon the children. So I made an interim order. When the case was in my list again I found the following letter awaiting me :

' Sir, with your permission I would like to drop my case against my husband for a seperation. You see Sir you gave him a chance and by doing that you seem to have performed a miracle for it has been the happiest month of our fifteen years married life, we both feel the same about it Sir. . . . He has been wonderful to me and the children and our home now is heaven when he comes home whereas before we were scared of him coming home. . . . '

In this case also the probation officer kept in tactful touch and a year later I received another letter of enthusiastic thanks. But this wife and mother, like Mrs P., had a strong case for divorce under the Act of 1937, popularly known as Herbert's Act. There was enough evidence of cruelty to make the granting of a decree probable.

It may be said that to some extent solicitors do for their paying clients seeking divorce the work that probation officers do for all seeking separation in Magistrates' Courts; they presumably see that their clients understand fully the results that must follow if a decree of divorce is obtained and assist in arranging for the proper custody and maintenance of any children of the marriage. But in

'poor persons' cases it is doubtful whether solicitors can do much more than prepare their clients' cases for trial. It has to be remembered that solicitors receive no training in social work and that only in exceptional cases would they be competent to deal with such problems as what are the real interests of women and children, especially in the lower ranks of the wage-earners. Far be it from my intention to disparage the work of solicitors in any way or to belittle the heavy work undertaken without reward by both branches of the legal profession in 'poor persons' cases. In fact, however, neither paying client nor 'poor persons' applicant receives the same kind of social help that is given by probation officers in magisterial domestic courts. The explanation lies not in any failure of solicitors, but in the fact that probation officers are trained social workers and have immense experience in the matrimonial crises of other people. Especially where there are young children of the marriage it seems obvious that both the parties, the children, and the general public would benefit if social assistance were made available, both in divorce and in separation. In 1938 2,773 'poor persons' applications by husbands in matrimonial suits in the High Court were granted; for wives the figure was no less than 5,117. During the war these unprecedented figures are probably much reduced. But after the war there will be another steep rise. So these problems will be of very real importance.

In Norway before the war those contemplating divorce or separation had always to submit their cases first to a mediation board. There are similar laws in other countries. The most modern comes from the State of California. An Act came into force on Sept. 19, 1939, providing compulsory conciliation procedure both for divorce and separation in every case where there are dependent children. Its key words are: 'Whenever any controversy exists between spouses which may, unless a reconciliation is achieved, result in the dissolution or annulment of the marriage, or in the disruption of the household, and there is any minor child of the spouses, or either of them, whose welfare might be affected. . . .' Here is an example of modern legislation in accord with the teachings both of Christianity and modern psychology. After the war, this Californian scheme should be examined

and its principles adopted as an essential part of our matrimonial legislation. It accepts a distinction that is very real, namely a distinction between parties who have minor children and parties whose quarrels can effect directly nobody but their own miserable selves. I venture to urge that in the adoption of this distinction and in the provision of compulsory conciliation procedure for all matrimonial disputes where there are minor children lies the possibility of a divorce law reform that will strengthen the bonds of marriage and minimise the possibilities of injuries to children arising from the selfishness of their parents. Whether the parents of young children ought to be granted a full divorce at all is a difficult question to answer and one on which there will be acute differences of opinion. But there should be widespread agreement that neither divorce nor separation should be granted in such case until the conciliation process had been tried. If such divorces have to be permitted, I venture to prophesy that by the time that these matters become the subject of parliamentary bill-drafting magisterial domestic courts will have so improved, and have won public respect to such an extent, that they will be accepted as the forum where attempts at conciliation will be made, both in applications for separation and in applications for divorce. The High Court will then only deal with cases where there is no possibility of reconciliation, but its judges will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that in every case that they have to handle where there are young children, genuine and human attempts have been made to prevent the disaster that threatens the children of the marriage.

CLAUD MULLINS.

## Art. 4.—THE RAT IN BRITAIN.

Two hundred years of indiscriminate shooting, trapping, and poisoning have failed to dislodge the alien rat from its hold upon our towns and our countryside. This, I think, is one of the most remarkable aspects of our natural history, and it is no wonder that the layman is appalled by the fact that each of our big towns is killing about 20,000 brown rats a year and each of our ports about 10,000 ship rats a year. We have been doing that all the century, and we have learned to fumigate rats in ships and factories with deadly hydrocyanic acid gas, we have learned to kill them with intestinal disease akin to enteritis by adding a virus or microbe culture to their food, and we have learned to rat-proof ships and buildings, but despite all this the rat is as firmly entrenched in our country as ever before ; it is still the most abundant mammal in all our ships, all our towns, all our sewers, warehouses, farmyards, underground railways, even to the coal mine and the lonely coastal island. This is no credit to our strategy in the war we have waged against the rat. It is typical of other countries from the arctic to the tropics ; and now the rat population is increasing again as in the last war.

Do we know sufficient of the habits and behaviour of the rat to justify a completely new strategy ? And would these new methods be any more successful than the old in checking its progress ? I would answer both questions in the affirmative, although before one suggests new methods for controlling the rat, we should consider how it has overcome all our past efforts.

I suppose that the rat's greatest asset is its universally common policy of adaptation to environment, which includes adaptation to our methods to destroy it ; our greatest handicap is the lack of a common unified plan of campaign in all the rat-infested ports and towns of the world. In Britain alone there are four main bodies dealing with the rat by their own methods and with a great deal of overlapping in some places and lack of cooperation in others—the pest officers of the Ministry of Agriculture deal with the rural part of it, the rodent officers of the Ministry of Food deal with a bit more where it affects warehouses and food stores, the various

local authorities' departments of public health deal with the bulk of the town rats, and the port sanitary authority in each harbour area deals with the ship and dock rats. And there are numerous private companies of vermin contractors chiefly engaged in pushing their own patent brand of rat poison to the exclusion of others and with little real value in exterminating the rat.

How far back in history the rat became man's unwelcome companion along the highway of commerce and civilisation it is difficult to trace, but it was much earlier than is generally assumed, for epidemics of rat-borne plague are recorded at Rome in 300 B.C. and A.D. 187 showing that the black ship rat was in Europe by that time, probably coming from the East where it still is the common house rat of the tropics, living in the roofs of the buildings that are mainly of wood without drains or sewers. Many of the carvings of small rodents on the Etruscan, Greek, and Roman monuments generally taken to represent mice are just as likely to portray the rat. But it was not until about the eighteenth century that the brown rat overran Europe and replaced the black rat as the common rat of town and country. The reason for the change is not clear. It is not answered completely by the fact that the brown rat is the larger and more aggressive of the two. The difference in their habits and the change in their environment with the beginnings of sanitation in our towns had much to do with it. The black ship rat, the inhabitant of primitive, insanitary towns, is a small, active, tree-climbing rat which often lives in the tops of palm trees in the East and will frequently enter a 'rat-proof' warehouse via the roof, which it reaches along pipes and telegraph wires. It does not inhabit sewers because it is not an underground rat and in the long rows of wooden houses of the early English towns its haunts were ideal. The brown town rat is an underground dweller, making liberal use of sewers and drains, so that when we began to drain our towns and our fields by methods other than surface drainage, the brown rat made quick use of the town sewers and the field drains. In the past ten years or so the number of black ship rats has increased again in cities like London, Cardiff, and Scarborough, and this is probably due to the increasing use of overhead cables

and telephone wires giving these tree rats access to buildings 'rat-proofed' against access of the brown rat from the ground. In the Liverpool air raids the flooding of basement cellars by firemen and the great fires drove the brown rats out of their usual haunts, and even now in the lull period without raids, it is common to find brown rats preferring upper floors of warehouses although this is abnormal. In one London building brown rats were found in the basement, the common black ship rat on the first floor, and the Alexandrine rat, the grey variety of the ship rat, on the top floor.

The black rat is a very fascinating creature, ancestor of the pet white rats we treasured in our schooldays. It is more domesticated than the brown rat, more friendly, fonder of warmth, less carnivorous, more timid, smaller in size with a more slender head, more prominent whiskers, ears and eyes, but with a tail that is longer than the rest of its body. It sits up, mouse-like, on its haunches to feed. A few brown rats inhabit the ships, but seldom are more than one or two trapped on a ship at Liverpool so that they cannot form more than about 1 per cent., with the rest black rats, although when rats have been fumigated out of a ship it may often become infested with mice which are better able to escape the fumigation in small retreats, especially in bags and crates of cargo. Although some 5,000 rats are caught each year in the Liverpool sewers, none is a black rat because it is not an underground animal, but at the dock quays and warehouses the numbers of black and brown rats are about equal, and in the city area the number of brown rats exceeds black by about nine to one. The black rat predominates at docks where foreign-going ships have permanent berths, but most of the post-1916 ships are rat-proofed and ships sometimes come into port without any rats on board. The old sea-going ships develop a long-established colony of black rats of their own, with a strong sense of territory right resenting the intrusion of new strange rats at ports of call, even driving them away, so that through inbreeding the colony eventually weakens itself and rat control suddenly becomes very successful. On the whole, however, ships rats are constitutionally stronger and more virile than town rats and much stronger poisons and viruses are required to control them.



In new ships the rats have not had time to develop a sufficiently strong sense of territory to drive out all newcomers, and a few rats picked up at each port of call introduce fresh blood which maintains a very virile constitution. However, compulsory ship fumigation has reduced the average number of rats per vessel from fifty-eight to one and a half. Rats usually live in colonies which keep themselves from each other, and when disease breaks out amongst them they migrate—an explanation of the sudden disappearance of rats in some places where a virus is used. On board ship they cannot migrate far, and merely spread the effect of the virus. The survivors of the epidemic are more immune; they will breed a race of immune rats unless a virus of increasing virulence is used to combat this immunity, and in the limited confines of ship or a small coastal island where the rats cannot migrate away a virus can be made successful. On land, however, the use of a virus does not have a very permanent success in rat control. Neither for that matter does trapping, because the gin-trap catches a surplus of males, the more active and roaming sex, and this upsets the sex ratio in favour of the females, which, less disturbed by the attention of the bucks, breed more successfully and thus eventually increase the rat population over a long period of trapping. The predominance of the trap in country rat-catching during the past two hundred years may explain much of the success of the rat to hold its own against us.

The black rat is not quite so prolific as the brown rat, having two or three litters of about ten young each, sometimes, however, as many as five litters in a season, whereas the larger brown rat has four to six litters, and there are records of broods of twenty-one and twenty-two. Black rats mature after three months, brown rats in six months. Our efforts at rat control are thwarted by the fact that many accepted methods of rat control are a failure in practice. Port authorities make it compulsory to fit rat guards to mooring ropes, but most of these are useless after a few months' rough treatment, which they generally receive, and they are generally fixed from the quay side instead of the ship end of the rope. And if the ship is within six feet of the quay the rat can jump on board, or make use of dummy barges, lighters,

loose ropes, fenders, etc. The Liverpool pattern of rat guard with a three-foot disc, fixed over the rope by a door in the lower half and a rubber and metal collar clamp, is very effective when new but not when it has been thrown about the deck or the quay for a few months. Gangways left out overnight are just as useful for rats as the doors left open by fire watchers in the 'rat-proof' warehouses in town. Fumigation with hydrocyanic acid gas followed by rat-proofing to prevent the movements of rats about ship from the hold and the bunkers to the rooms is the only reliable control. Even then one must remember that many foreign ports of call have no efficient rat control, and in war-time during the rapid turning of ships the stevedores work all night with gangways and cranes, and a convoy cannot miss the tide while a ship is treated for rats. The cargo itself introduces many ship rats, even in the power chutes used to suck up grain.

Dockyards as well as ships will have to be rat-proofed with stone and ferro-concrete wharves in place of old timber quays, and with better types of refreshment rooms and other rat haunts. The war-time accumulation of grain and other goods on the quays is a serious attraction to rats, just as is the large stock of meat and other food-stuffs in our food factories and warehouses. In dockside buildings the black rat is generally found in the walls, ceilings, and roofs; the brown rat in the cellars, drains, and under the wooden floors. The Liverpool dock estate is well rat-proofed. Roadways and pavings of sheds consist of setts on a concrete foundation; new sheds are built of bricks and reinforced concrete with no ledges, beams, or angle-irons for rat-runs. Small buildings are built on brick or concrete piers clear of the ground and old ropes, dunnage, etc., are stored on platforms eighteen inches from the ground. The rat-proofing of ships here includes the use of skeleton casings for pipes in the place of the older type of box casing and expanded metal is fitted around pipes, telephone wires, or electric wires, especially where they pass through bulkheads from one compartment to another, and at openings for light and ventilation. The pilots visiting vessels entering the port have a list of the danger ports abroad where outbreaks of plague and other rat-borne diseases have been reported

recently; and if the vessel has called at such ports, sample rats are caught for pathological examination. Any signs of plague amongst rats or the crew mean that the ship is breasted more than six feet from the quay and rats are trapped over a quarter of a mile radius of dockland for examination. Black rats do not usually travel more than half a mile, and they do not inhabit the outskirts of Liverpool on the side opposite to the docks. The results of some experiments at marking black rats with identity tags at Liverpool and releasing them showed that one released at the West Bramley Moore dock was caught nine months later at a dock four miles away. The strong territory sense of the different ships' colonies was shown when a black rat caught in one ship's hold was tagged and released in another ship in another dock, but when caught the following day it had already quitted its new ship and was in a shed in the adjacent dock. At Liverpool, a ship is not given a certificate of exemption from rat infestation if even one or two rats are detected by the rat-searchers who go aboard looking for such signs as droppings, footprints, gnawed woodwork or cargo. A rigid policy something like this applied to town warehouses and farm rickyards would bring better results with the brown rat. It takes a trained rat-searcher four hours to search a typical 4,000-5,000 ton cargo boat, and as much as six hours to search a large passenger vessel. The increase of the black ship rat in some of our cities does not, of course, necessarily bring any great danger of plague, for as I pointed out in an article in 'The Lancet' (Vol. I, No. 5) even the regular presence of the plague flea on the rats in some of our ports does not produce outbreaks of plague because the fleas are not infected.

Intelligence, or that mental ability evolved in years of persecution when an animal must survive by its wits, has reached a fairly high standard with black and brown rats. There are many good accounts of a number of rats working in unison to remove food too bulky for one to carry. One rat has clasped food in its paws, turned on its back, and the other rat has dragged it by the tail. Rodwell recorded two rats passing eggs to one another step by step down a stairway, while many years ago an article in the 'Quarterly Review' describes the reverse

movement. A mirror fascinates rats as much as it fascinates robins, and many a box trap has proved successful with a mirror at one end. Rats are much more wary of human scent than are mice, and unless one wears gloves when setting steel traps, or sprays the trap with a fine jet of water to remove the scent of one's hands, the traps fail oftener than with mice.

The examination of hundreds of rat-catchers' returns for many years has failed to show any of those regular cycles of increase and decrease in numbers so typical of voles, rabbits, and lemmings. No doubt such biological cycles are there, but they are masked by the effects of trapping, poisoning, and fumigation. So many artificial factors interfere with the rat population that biological cycles have probably ceased to have any importance in our western countries. In Bristol the number of ship rats decreased between 1929 and 1940 from 1,001 to 677, but during the same period at Cardiff they extended their range from dockland to the city area where the numbers caught increased from 37 to 570. Something similar occurred in London and Cardiff, but in Liverpool the number of ship rats and town rats has been declining steadily during the whole period, due chiefly to the high standard of rat-control methods. In the city area of Liverpool the number of black ship rats caught decreased from 309 in 1936 to 158 in 1940. There was a peak total of 13,509 rats caught on Liverpool ships in 1924, which by 1929 had dropped to 7,036 and by 1937 to 2,847, the steady decline being the result of compulsory fumigation and rat-proofing; very little use is made of traps, virus, and poisons.

It is often overlooked that we have more than one rat in Britain and the methods applied to one rat may not have the same success with the other. The brown rat is another creature altogether from the black rat of the ships. It is much bigger, heavier, and fatter, with a tail that is not quite the length of its body, and although it can climb, it makes its main highways about the sewers, the field drains, the dykes, ditches, and wooden floors. But to add to the confusion of identification at a glance, there is a black variety of the brown rat called the Irish rat, a brown variety of the black rat, *Mus. concolor*, and a grey variety of the black rat, *Mus.*

*alexandrinus*. The last named is the form which is steadily increasing its numbers in the city area of London. In fighting the brown rat, we have for too long adopted similar methods for the concentrated population of towns, with the ever present risk of reinfestation after trapping and poisoning, and the scattered population of the countryside, where the main attractions are the stack-yards, as any threshing time will reveal, and the main encouragement the persecution of such useful predatory creatures as the barn-owl, tawny owl, little owl, long-eared owl, buzzard, heron, stoat, otter, and fox which prey extensively upon rats. In the town, fumigation and compulsory rat-proofing of all large buildings, and in the country, ferreting the rats out of their burrows are the most useful methods of reducing their numbers. But ruins and rubble of blitzed buildings in the towns and extermination of rabbits from rural warrens have given the rats new war-time strongholds. The brown rats inhabit the new field drains in summer, and after the corn is harvested they return to town or the corn rick. Beyond this, I do not think that the brown rat is a very great wanderer. Some very interesting results were gained from marking rats in London and releasing them at Euston station. One was caught 190 miles away at Bradford, after an interval of six months, another 150 miles away at Shrewsbury, a third 145 miles away at Matlock, and a fourth 113 miles away in Norfolk, while several were caught up to 50 miles away only a week or two after their release. But there is nothing to prove that these rats did not travel the distances hidden in goods on trains. Rats will converge from a wide area upon a food store that is carrying large stocks of meat or fish which have an attractive odour, but a lot of this trouble can be prevented by rat-proofing the building against all access through drains, ventilators, basements, door-corners, etc., and by the subsequent activities of the factory. The latter is an important point, because expensive rat-proofing is often nullified by careless fire watchers or night workers leaving doors and basement windows open. There was one large northern food factory which I advised on rat-proofing after rats were being caught at the rate of fifty a week on a seven-acre plant, but excellent rat-proofing was ruined when a new

conveyor was made through the wall of the store-room to afford speedy loading.

A remarkable find was made in Barnsley in 1935 when alterations to business premises revealed an arched recess covered by an old wall, and in a heap thirty inches by ten inches were the bones and skulls of numerous rats, suggesting that immense numbers had gone there to die. One of the disadvantages of poisoning is that the rats go away to die and their bodies produce an offensive odour. Trapping is successful in skilled hands when the bait is an alternative to the local food supply, and it generally consists of such appealing substances as fish like red herring, bloaters or smoked kipper, oatmeal, rolled oats, ham, tallow, dripping, banana, bread and milk sop or cooked cabbage, flavoured with aniseed or castor sugar or ground saccharine powder. Poisoned baits are most effective when a careful search of rat-runs has found the most favoured spots and these are first baited without any poison to attract the rats to feed at that spot; a gap of a day or two leaves the rats hungry and eager, and then the bait is suddenly poisoned and put down in abundance to kill the maximum number at once before they become shy of the poisoned spot, and in the way typical of rats, communicate to one another and avoid the place. Baits should also be varied from time to time, and although the fairly safe red squill extract or red squill biscuit is now difficult to obtain, for it is imported, very small quantities of white arsenic are usually more successful than dangerous amounts of barium carbonate or phosphorus. Strychnine, used so much in America, is definitely a successful poison, but it is too dangerous and too bitter for general use. A skilled rat-trapper can, of course, make good use of a trap without bait by setting it in the ground in a rat-run, covering with a sheet of paper, and then the loose earth or dust on top. The position of the trap is usually more important than its bait and many a trap is avoided because it is not in the best position. Few works' managers appreciate the number of traps required, which should be about ten times the number of rats seen or suspected on the place. National Rat Week was chosen at a very suitable time at the beginning of November when the rats were journeying from the country to the towns for



the winter, but it was very feebly carried out and the propaganda effect was little better than the propaganda film 'Kill that Rat.' Propaganda should make people sit up and *do* something about it, instead of merely agreeing that the rat is a menace. The average English business man looks upon the rat as such a loathsome creature that he avoids having anything to do with it. An ounce of practical rat-catching experience is worth a pound of academical advice, but we must first raise the standard of the rat-catcher and his wage. Rat catching should not be looked upon as a loathsome occupation only fit for dirty Irishmen at a remuneration of a penny a tail.

The brown rat was first recorded in Britain in 1728 and it has been given many names like 'sewer rat,' 'Norway rat,' 'grey rat,' and 'water-rat,' although in the canals and rivers it is often confused with the water-vole. Old canal barges and wooden wharves considerably increase rats along these inland waterways. Asia Minor or Persia was probably the original haunt of the brown rat but it is now cosmopolitan in its distribution. Although less cunning than the black rat, and without the affectionate ways which have made many a ship's rat the pet of the seamen's 'glory hole,' the brown rat is not without intelligence, and experiments have shown that when unexpectedly trapped in all directions it shows emotional breakdowns similar to those of children. In large buildings the rats have their favoured runs just like the hares over the fields. In most towns there is a permanent rat populace in the sewers and drains which are also used as highways. About 350 to 450 rats are caught each month in the Liverpool sewers and this number remains fairly constant, showing remarkable uniformity throughout the year. On the land, rats increase most in a wet season and decrease in long droughts as in 1933, but the flooding of town sewers by abnormal rainfall does not reduce the rats, although they have shown themselves to be very afraid of mass fires and of the complete basement flooding by firemen's pumps during air raids.

The distribution of the brown rat in a great city, compared with the black rat, can be seen from Liverpool's rat-catching returns for one of the pre-war years, 1929.



In that year 6,742 black rats and 9 brown rats were caught on the ships ; 938 black rats and 52 brown rats on the quays ; 368 black rats and 29 brown rats in other parts of the port area ; 3,196 brown rats and 1,676 black rats in the city warehouses ; 6,013 brown rats and no black rats in the sewers ; and in shops and other places in the city area, 5,243 brown rats and 270 black rats. Only the more modern of English factories have the high standard of rat-proofing found in America, but the rat-proofing has to be very efficient if it is to keep out hungry rats. The difficulty of obtaining metal for rat-proofing in war-time has made it necessary to use other substances like asbestos and plywood poisoned with iron sulphate, but little short of stone, hard concrete, metal, or very hard wood like jarrah or greenheart will stop a hungry rat. In food factories I have seen where these rats have gnawed through the cork insulation of chill rooms and lived amongst the stored foodstuffs at temperatures little above freezing point. Their range of diet is amazing. On board ship certain cargoes like ground-nuts are more attractive than others to the black rat, but ashore the brown rat is much more omnivorous. It will raid gardens to eat bulbs and even flowers like carnations and sweet peas, and the popularity of garden bird-tables, as well as the construction, but little use, of underground garden air-raid shelters have each contributed to the increase of the rat in suburbia. The restrictions upon the use of strychnine handicap efficient poisoning campaigns in rural places, but in Lancashire success has been gained by trapping rats with ' blitzed ' foodstuffs like figs salvaged from the air-raid fires. Communal rubbish tips and the increasing pollution of ponds and rivers by housing estates, military camps, and new war-time factories is a serious blow to years of work in rat control. Pollution of an inland waterway will generally drive away most of the natural birds and mammals, but the rat remains and thrives upon pollution, as its numbers at the sewage farms testify. There was one case last year in which a very large rubbish tip constantly burning was swarming with rats in its innermost recesses and no method of rat control could get rid of them. We must learn to utilise more of our rubbish for manure and salvage than ever we did in the luxury days of peace, and we must learn

to bury more, covering it with two or three feet of earth and farming on top, instead of defacing our countryside with large and ugly rubbish tips filling up the old ponds and quarries.

It is true that in British and American ports generally, the rat is slowly being brought under control on board ship, but in the countryside the rat remains out of control, and the same can be said for most of our towns. This is a very serious position if we cannot guarantee to the future post-war generation fewer rats than we have in the country to-day. It has been estimated that there are 55,000,000 rats in Britain. I do not know how the figures were arrived at although it is possible that such is the number; it is certain that there are far more rats than human beings and that if we are keeping the rat at bay, it is as much as we are doing. The countryside is becoming more suitable for the habits of the rat, and unless our methods change the next generation will have more rats than are here to-day. War-time is bringing conditions which encourage more rats on ships, more rats in towns, and more rats in the extra cornland; and the war-time disturbance of our commerce and industry and especially the disturbance of the countryside, are all in favour of the rat. The old-fashioned methods of trapping, poisoning and shooting are but temporary in their effects. They will never exterminate the rat from the countryside. We must budget a heavy expense for rat control and the longer we ignore this fact the stronger will be the position of the rat. And the rat will still be our grave enemy after the armistice.

Some control over town factories and warehouses similar to the rigorous methods maintained by our port sanitary authorities is long overdue, even if there is not the same fear of plague epidemics to act as a stimulant. The 1941 Infestation Order of the Ministry of Food which came into force in January 1942 is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough and it can achieve its purpose only if persistently and widely enforced. It must not be flouted like the Rats and Mice (Destruction) Act of 1919. The war-time rodent controls established by the Ministry of Food and the Ministry of Agriculture are sound enough in themselves, and probably better than anything we have had before, and they are helped

by some of the best academic advice in the world ; but the position of the rat is such a grave handicap to our war effort in food production and transport that one is justified in suggesting efforts to improve these organisations. The training of land army girls to help overcome the shortage of rat-catchers is still largely a suggestion ; but rat-catching is a skilled art based much upon experience and greater use should have been made of the elderly gamekeepers thrown out of employment by the war-time decline in game preservation. It has been my experience that the rodent officers of the Ministry of Food rodent control have far too large an area to cover—one official, for instance, told me he covered three counties—and far too little power to compel warehouse managers to increase the number of traps and to bring about a better combination between municipal and civil service authorities. No doubt the organisation is handicapped by limited funds and the fact that the salaries of the district rodent officers are insultingly small when compared with much less important and less intelligent work in the 'cost plus' munitions factories. The rodent officers make their reports where there is evidence of damage by rats, and their recommendations are sent in to headquarters which, I understand, allocates the contracts for rat control only to members of a certain association of vermin poison manufacturers. This does not give much scope for original ideas, and as most of these private firms use only their own patent poison some of the results are not of very permanent effect. Indeed one important rodent officer told me that, although strychnine is officially banned, one of his assistants had to resort to it secretly in order to control the rats in a certain area, and that his critical views of the values of some of the remedies used by the contractors could not be put forward because these people were in the favoured association. I do not think that any one of the many patent rat poisons or viruses in this country would exterminate the rat in Britain because of the immunity which is bred amongst the inevitable survivors ; the poisons and cultures would have to be used with increasing virulence and variation to overcome this adaptation or immunity of the rats. There is no short and easy way to rat extermination in this or any other country. There is no

single magical poison or seductive bait that will bring somebody a fortune by its discovery. The only way that seems to offer any permanent prospects of ridding the country of the rat menace is a unified campaign of very many important points based upon the behaviour of the rat in relation to each local habitat, points which may seem trivial and superfluous, like continuous and compulsory rat-proofing everywhere, and more compulsion upon private rat control by the owners and users of property, and this will have to be kept up for at least a generation without the least relaxation before there are very noticeable signs of the retreat of the rat.

All vessels, excepting certain coastwise vessels, are required to undergo periodic examination every six months in order to ensure that the rat population is kept down to a minimum; something similar will have to be done with the main rat haunts ashore. Since the war the rat has received a generous amount of publicity. The previous world war focused similar interest upon it. But what is not so well appreciated is that our present war-time rat troubles are largely the result of our policy, or lack of policy, in rat control before the war. And if we drop our interest in the rat when this war ends, and leave the job of fighting the rat to the same jumble of independent local campaigns and unorganised national effort, the next war in which we take part will find us fighting the rat again as well as the enemy.

The best help, it seems, can only come from the biologist. I do not think that the chemist can help us with any new discovery of a poison of greater results than any rat poison in use to-day, for although the chemist has dominated many of the fields of insect pest control, like the protection of textiles against moths and beetles by the new insecticides he has produced, we cannot use many of his poisons because the haunts of the rat are in such close proximity to mankind and man's food. If the chemist could reveal to us something that would be very much more toxic to the rat than is red squill, but without the bitter unpalatability of strychnine, and yet harmless to domestic animals and man, then indeed it would prove a boon; but such a chemical has not been forthcoming. Nor can the engineer help us with temperature control as he has helped us control so

many insect pests, for the rat is so adaptable and haunts so many places where we cannot raise or lower the temperature at will. Many people have thought that because the musk-rat was so quickly and efficiently trapped out of its strongholds ten years ago, a similar trapping campaign would control the brown rat. But it would not, because the brown rat is not limited to aquatic haunts like the musk-rat and as fast as one trapped it from the haunts that can be trapped, the places would be repopulated from those that are not suitable for trapping. Poisonous baits and fumigants are impossible in most food stores and factories. Cats do kill rats but their influence upon the rat population is negligible, and the predatory creatures of the countryside cannot hunt the rat out of its main haunts in the town sewers, drains, and warehouses. The mongoose is useless in the warehouse because it very soon wanders off to the countryside with its more attractive game-birds and poultry. An army of ferrets and mongooses let loose in our cities would only replace one vermin with another. We have two hundred years of wasted opportunity to make up, and we have the unenviable task of bringing almost the whole world into unison upon a policy of rigorous rat suppression before we can hope to see the rat in retreat; and for a country like ours which must live upon the world trade that brought the rat here and took it all over the world, there is no easier method.

ERIC HARDY.

## Art. 5.—SALTS OF THE EARTH.

THE recent announcement that army units were being specially trained as 'sea-soldiers' for service on board ship recalls the great part played at sea by so many of our regiments in the past. The first duty of our standing army, indeed, from very early days, was to man the fleet. Thus when, in 1757, the 24th Foot returned from the maritime expedition to Rochefort it was continued at the disposal of the Admiralty for service at sea; and two years later (as the 69th) it found a strong detachment to serve, alongside other regiments, in the fleet which supported Wolfe's capture of Quebec.

All this was strictly in accordance with custom. The manning of the fleet by soldiers, begun, as was fitting, by the Grenadier Guards (of whose sea-fight at Solebay de Ruyter declared that it was the stiffest he had ever seen), was carried on well into the post-Napoleonic years; and certainly a majority of our regiments have at one time or another, either complete or in detachments, fought as 'sea-service soldiers.' \*

Not haphazard does one cite this 69th Foot (nowadays 2nd Welch) as an example of sea-soldiering. Its record therein really is remarkable, including as it does employment under Rodney in the West Indies, where it took part in his great battle with de Grasse in 1782; another sea-fight, under Hood, in the Mediterranean; and yet another, under the third of the celebrated trio, Howe, when its strong detachment shared in the 'Glorious First of June,' on board the *Leviathan*, of stirring memory. Later still, other detachments had the supreme honour of fighting under Nelson himself, in the *Agamemnon* and *Captain*, taking part in the siege of Genoa, the cutting-out of store-ships in Loano Bay, the operations off Leghorn, the capture of Porto Ferrajo, and other triumphs of the Italian cruise. The regiment's crowning achievement was at Cape St Vincent, when its boarders were the first to enter the powerful *San Nicolas*, whose capture paved the way for the surrender of the Spanish admiral to Nelson on board the *San Josef*.

In full measure the 69th had its ups and downs.

---

\* Distinct from the Royal Marines proper, who date from about 1755.  
Vol. 279.—No. 554. N

When, in the year before St Vincent, part of it had sailed in convoy from Corsica for Gibraltar, the expedition was captured by the French *en bloc*. In the darkness one night the ship which bore the regiment escaped ; only for the majority of the officers and men to suffer shipwreck shortly afterwards on board the *Courageux*, in the Gibraltar straits, when coming home.

Later, in what our own epic times would call 'commando work,' this time in the Indian Ocean, the regimental grenadiers were in the *Néreide*, frigate, when she was taken by *La Vénus* ; to be freed again by our *Boadicea*, which took both prize and captor. It was once more acting as marines at the capture of Java in 1811 ; and then, so that nothing should be lacking from its sea-service, it was set to chasing pirates in Borneo and the Celebes, and at Goa, before it returned for a space to land soldiering (of which, be it remembered, it always had its fill—' Waterloo ' is but one of the names upon its Colours) in the Mahratta wars. Small wonder that in the regimental messes there should hang pictures of naval actions principally, or that the trophy they most treasure should be the snuff-box made from the wood of the *San Josef*.

Choosing here and there among the regiments which, from Queen Anne's reign onwards, were lent or raised for temporary sea-service, one sees the 30th (now 1st East Lancashire), with the next two regiments of the line, placed at Admiralty disposal for the War of the Spanish Succession. Together with the 4th (Royal Lancaster), of whom the British commander recorded that ' ever since it joined my army it has always been on action,' it was with Rooke in 1704 at the capture of Gibraltar, as well as in the sea-fight off Malaga which followed (on the same day as Blenheim). It fought under Peterborough on land and under Cloudesley Shovel at sea. A little later, in places so far apart as Corsica, Nova Scotia, Dunkirk, and the West Indies, it saw further strenuous fighting. A spell of soldiering at home ; and then Minorca, Gibraltar again (this time for its defence), followed by another expedition in the Channel with the fleet, including Anson's action off Finisterre. During the Seven Years' War the 30th shared in many raids on the French coast, as well as in the siege of Belleisle. The



American struggle found it fighting on the Carolina coast, where one of its services was the conveying of Loyalists from their homes to new ones in Jamaica.

Back again to Europe to serve with Hood in the Mediterranean. Minorca, which it helped to capture. Blockade of Malta and siege of Valetta. A stiffly opposed landing at Alexandria under Abercromby, with, for a change, a great march to Cairo. One company, during the next war with France, was shipwrecked within sight of Calais; and the regiment proceeded without it to Malacca, and thence to Madras, placing detachments on board various ships whenever, and wherever, there was fighting to be had with the French in the Bay of Bengal. Seventeen years was the duration of one of its spells abroad after that; and every spell sparkles with names which have lately been again on all men's lips.

Taking some of the regiments which were more expressly 'lent' for naval duty, the 6th (Royal Warwick) served aboard the fleet in the great Cadiz expedition of 1702, when, with others, it helped in a celebrated haul of galleons in Vigo Bay. Following the *Torbay*, of 80 guns, in their various ships, the troops landed and stormed the batteries, capturing an enormous booty. The 35th (Royal Sussex) performed, throughout the eighteenth century, exploits which are only equalled by its achievements upon land. There is, too, the 45th (now 1st Sherwood Foresters), which saw a deal of stirring sea-service in the Indies, both East and West, when Labourdonnais and Duplex were contending so mightily against us.

Three regiments in succession bore the number 86, and most of their earliest service was at sea. The first of them, in 1758, shared in the expedition to Goree, when part of it (with part of the 76th) was wrecked in the man-o'-war *Lichfield*, on the coast of Barbary, and afterwards suffered a long captivity among the Moors. The second bearer of the number served as marines in the West Indies and on the North American station. The third (County Down), which is now the 2nd Royal Ulster Rifles, at one time rivalled the 69th in respect to sea-fighting, when it served as marines in the *Triumph* and *Brunswick*, under Cornwallis, in an action on June 17, 1795; in Lord Bridport's action which followed; and in the *Hector*, later in the same year, off Corsica and Minorca.

Detachments of it were similarly employed about the same time off the Azores, in the Mediterranean, and in the estuary of the Tagus, under Admiral Mason, and under Duncan in the North Sea. As for the Rifle Brigade, it shares with the 69th the honour of having fought with Nelson, for it had a detachment on board his flagship, the *Elephant*, at the Battle of the Baltic.

The name of a ship fills most of what is now known of the sea-services of an older 85th than the direct predecessor of our 2nd K.S.L.I. It, too, served during the War of Independence, though for the most part in Jamaica, being known as the 'Westminster Volunteers.' The bulk of it perished (with part of the 15th) in the *Ville de Paris*, three-decker, along with the *Centaur* and other prizes taken in Rodney's battle with de Grasse (already referred to), when all these ships were swept away by a cyclone off the Newfoundland banks, being homeward bound.

Every regiment of our Army has in its Valhalla one or more ships in which, either in war or peace, it faced stern ordeals. The *Birkenhead's* story, so well known, need only be touched on here. Many regiments, indeed, share her, for she carried only drafts—for 12th Lancers, 2nd, 6th, 12th, 43rd, 45th, 60th, 73rd, 74th, and 91st Foot. She was a barque-rigged iron paddle-steamer of 2,000 tons, which had already been used for trooping, and was bound from Queenstown to the Cape when she met her end. On Feb. 25, 1852, before dawn, she struck a rock off the entrance to Simon's Bay and sank in twenty minutes. Of the 638 souls on board only 184 were saved, including all the women and children. The rest went down, standing in their ranks as though at drill. It is interesting to recall to-day that so universal was the admiration at the discipline displayed by all concerned that the Kaiser directed that attention be called to it in an order read at the head of every regiment in his service on three successive parades.

Twenty-eight years earlier it had been the turn of the 31st Foot (now 1st East Surrey), in the East Indiaman *Kent*, which carried a wing of the regiment and which caught fire on the night of March 1, 1835, when ten days out from England *en route* for India. The flames having gained the mastery, she was lying hove-to, in imminent

danger from the large store of gunpowder which she carried in her hold. Abortive attempts were made to cover the hatches with wet sails ; and when, as a last resort, some of the lower gun-ports were opened to let in the seas, the only result was that several of the men were drowned.

It was too rough to lower a boat. Soldiers, passengers, and crew assembled on deck, the men of the 31st setting a fine example by their steadiness and courage. As the flames crept closer to the powder hold, one of the officers, Sir Duncan Macgregor, scribbled a message and threw it overboard in a bottle. '*Kent*, Indiaman, on fire,' it said. 'Elizabeth, Joanna, and self commit our spirits into the hands of our Blessed Redeemer, whose grace enables us to be quite composed in the awful prospect of entering Eternity.' (Many months afterwards the message was picked up in Barbados.)

But at daybreak they sighted the brig *Cambria*. After several attempts the *Kent* succeeded in getting away three boats ; and in the end all the women and children were successfully transferred to the brig, which, however, was forced to keep away because of the danger from the *Kent's* ammunition, and because of her guns being shotted and the impossibility of drawing the charges.

Another night came on, and the *Cambria* disappeared, to be providentially replaced in the nick of time by a second brig, the *Caroline*, bound from England to Alexandria, which had seen the blaze and hastened to assist. But as her people looked they beheld only a sheet of flame and then darkness. At dawn her boats picked up fourteen survivors, among them being Macgregor.

So many acts of bravery and endurance are to-day being performed by the men of our Merchant Navy that, in one respect certainly, we may claim to be better than some of our predecessors, whose discipline in emergencies was not always exemplary. There is, for instance, the story of the *Devonport* ; and in the 60th Rifles her name will ever be connected with those of two young officers, Robinson and Lindesay, for to them was chiefly due the safety of the vessel, which, on Nov. 25, 1865, had carried part of their third battalion from Port Blair, in the Andamans, to Madras. Heavy seas prevented the troops

being landed on that surf-fringed shore, and at eight o'clock in the morning the ship stood out again to sea. By evening a cyclone had overtaken her, masts and spars were gone, and she had become an almost unmanageable wreck. The crew, giving themselves up for lost, refused to come on deck. At this, the two young officers mentioned, with a party of soldiers, fell to with axes, and in spite of almost superhuman difficulties managed to clear the wreckage which was threatening disaster. The ship was saved, and a fortnight later, battered but still seaworthy, cast anchor in Madras roads.

Eight years previously a wing of the 54th (2nd Dorest) was on board the transport *Sarah Sands*, on passage from Gibraltar to Calcutta, when in the Indian Ocean she caught fire. She only just managed to reach Mauritius, 400 miles away, before she was burned to the water's edge; and she never would have escaped had it not been for the bravery and devotion of the troops. A section of the crew had to be very firmly dealt with to keep order. In the end every soul on board (and the number included many women and children) was saved.

The 91st Highlanders can recall with pride equal to that which they take in the *Birkenhead* the story of another 'regimental' ship, the *Abercrombie Robinson*, wrecked near Cape Town in 1846, when 500 men of the reserve battalion fell in on deck and awaited orders, only breaking their ranks when now one party and then another was detailed to help the non-combatants into the boats. Thirty years before that part of another Highland regiment, the 78th (2nd Seaforth), had earned fame in the wreck of the 700-ton sailing-ship *Francis and Charlotte*, Batavia to Calcutta, which struck a submerged rock off Preparis Island between North Andaman and the mouths of the Irrawaddy; and after heroic efforts as the ship sank, officers and men endured without discouragement or discontent terrible privations for over a month on a remote and inhospitable shore.

Again, as in the case of the *Ville de Paris*, the cold northern latitudes were the scene of peril to the *Alert*. In the summer of 1842 this vessel, a hired barque, was taking a detachment of the 64th (1st North Stafford) from Nova Scotia to Plymouth when she ran on a reef about 100 miles from Halifax, and began to fill so rapidly

that it was decided to attempt to beach her. On this occasion the men were ordered to remain below, as the master declared that the transfer of 200 people to the deck would cause the ship to labour to such an extent as to be in danger of foundering. When this was explained to the men by their officers they all stood quietly in their ranks below while the water rose slowly to their knees. Eventually the ship was successfully beached and all (including a number of women and children) were saved. No less a personage than the old Duke of Wellington, the commander-in-chief, it was who called attention in a special order to the occurrence, directing that full details should be communicated to the Army, 'for an example and a guide.'

In a little book called 'The Wreck on the Andamans' are recorded the adventures of detachments of the 10th, 50th, and 80th Foot when, in 1844, they were wrecked upon those islands. Of the two ships with which it is principally concerned, the barques *Runnymede* and *Briton*, the first-named, bound from Gravesend to Calcutta with 100 men of the 50th (now 1st West Kent) and 40 of the 10th (Lincoln) on board, was dismasted by a hurricane in the Bay of Bengal and cast upon the Andamans. She had narrowly escaped, at the height of the storm, being run down by another ship, which passed close under her bows, and which afterwards proved to be the *Briton*, from Sydney, also bound to Calcutta, and which was carrying over 300 men of the 80th (now 2nd South Stafford), together with many families. When the *Runnymede*, after a terrific battering, was cast up in a cove of the Great Andaman, she found the *Briton*, 'to the great astonishment of her crew, about a quarter of a mile inside of them, high amongst the trees, in a swamp of mangroves, whither she had forced herself a passage.'

A ship's name, too, comes to mind when one thinks of the Buffs—prototype, one might style it, of all our marine regiments, and descended from the train-bands of Elizabeth. Great as were its sea-exploits throughout English history, we must be content with instancing a peace-time episode, which occurred as recently as 1860, on board the hired sailing-transport *Athleta*, homeward bound from China. It provides another of those rare instances of a ship's civilian crew failing in its duty.

The gold fever in Australia was at its height and the cause of frequent desertions among British mariners, so that when the *Athleta* arrived at Cape Town her crew made a determined effort to abscond.

They reckoned, however, without the three companies of Buffs who were on board, and who took turns in piqueting the gangways to prevent unauthorised egress. Thereupon the crew refused to work the ship.

At this juncture the Buffs' commander offered to sail the *Athleta* home with his own men, at the same time detailing a guard to deal with the malcontents. The master readily agreed and put to sea with his amateur crew. Volunteers were called for to go aloft, and sixty men immediately offered themselves for the work, which they carried out successfully for a week. This brought the mutineers to their senses. They prayed to be allowed to return to duty and were permitted to do so.

The case of the *Warren Hastings* provides, in our own time, an outstanding example of soldierly discipline in the face of emergency. A steamship of the Royal Indian Marine, she was carrying over a thousand of the 60th Rifles between Cape Town and Mauritius when, on the night of Jan. 14, 1897, while proceeding at full speed, she ran on a rock and was wrecked. Lord Wolseley, the then commander-in-chief, issued an order of the day in which he alluded 'with pride and satisfaction' to the fact that 'from first to last perfect discipline was maintained, and all orders were instantly obeyed, without noise, confusion, or hesitation'; and how, owing to this courage and discipline, almost everybody was enabled to reach the shore, 'saved, in many cases, by the individual gallantry of comrades.' By a piece of great good fortune, it happened that the spot where the *Warren Hastings* went ashore was the only one on all that rock-bound coast on which survivors could be landed.

As for conundrums and more or less recondite questions which crop up in a search of Army maritime history, they are numerous and intriguing. How many soldiers could correctly say, first, what was 'Admiral Christian's Hurricane,' mentioned in an account of the 10th Foot\*;

---

\* Actually a series of hurricanes, which thrice scattered a large expedition to the West Indies under Admiral Sir Cloberry Christian, in 1795-6, with great loss of life.



and, second, where is 'Slashers' Reef,' and with what incident to what regiment is the name connected? For a third: Did any *cavalry* regiment besides the 17th Lancers ever furnish a contingent to fight on board ship as marines? A few years previous to 'Admiral Christian's Hurricane,' what regiment, or parts of regiments, were in the ill-fated *Hallswell*, East Indiaman, which carried, we read somewhere, 'many passengers, mostly soldiers,' when, outward bound, she ran aground near Seacombe and had only a handful of survivors? These saved themselves by climbing from a ledge a 200-foot cliff, by the aid of ropes suspended from the top and blown by the force of the wind to within their grasp.

Particular ill-luck, sometimes lasting over lengthy periods, seems to have followed certain regiments when at sea. The 90th (now 2nd Cameronians), for example, narrowly saved from destruction in the *Maria Somes*, during a hurricane in the Indian Ocean, in 1846, was wrecked again, a few days later, when aboard H.M.S. *Thunderbolt*, the man-o'-war which had rescued it. When, under the then very unpopular 'Cardwell System,' this regiment was linked with the old 26th, and took its name, it could, however, tell the latter nothing it did not already know with regard to shipwreck; for, just over forty years previously, while on its way to France one half of the 26th (to-day 1st Scottish Rifles) had met with disaster on the Goodwins and the other on the coast near Calais.

Then there were the peregrinations of the 80th Foot, in 1801 (forty years before its adventure in the *Briton*, already recorded), in its efforts to join up with Baird's force in the Red Sea, for his great desert march to Cairo. Headquarters and three companies were driven back by contrary winds and, after beating about for weeks, had to return to Bombay. Five other companies succeeded in joining the desert column and reached Cairo, whither they were followed by a detachment which had been wrecked in the Red Sea with the loss of the mess-plate and all the regimental records. After a strenuous year in Egypt these companies recrossed the desert to Suez and embarked for India, and a portion of them again suffered shipwreck, this time on the Abyssinian coast. Eventually, at Cannanore, the remnants, after a three years' separation, rejoined their headquarters and the



companies which had been left behind in India, and which, incidentally, had put in most of their time in amphibious operations along the coast of Malabar.

A search in our cathedral aisles for Colours long ago laid up (*lucus a non lucendo* : Colours only by courtesy now, although old stained-glass can set them again aglow) starts many a reverie in by-ways of Army maritime history. The oldest stand of Scottish regimental colours in St Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh, placed there with public ceremony many years ago, are those of an early 82nd Foot, raised in the Lowlands at the expense of a Duke of Hamilton during the American War of Independence. In its brief existence this unit had more than its share of ocean perils, for it lost its flank companies in a storm off the New Jersey coast on its way back to Scotland from that war. Its lineal successor (to-day 2nd South Lancashire), during the tempestuous winter of 1816, met with disaster off the Old Head of Kinsale, when the transport *Boadicea* foundered with all hands. This was the same storm which overwhelmed the 59th (2nd East Lances), also on its way from Dover to the south of Ireland. Few soldiers-at-sea can have deemed themselves less fortunate than they ; for both *Seahorse* and *Lord Melville*, which carried them, went ashore on the Irish coast at the same time. Of 16 officers, 300 other ranks, and 73 women and children, there survived from the *Seahorse* but four subalterns and 22 men. A monument to the memory of those that perished may still, it is said, be seen in Tramore Bay.

We may end this brief review, perhaps not inappropriately, with a reference to the 'Old Hundredth' in the year of Trafalgar—not, indeed, the regiment which became at last the 1st Leinster Regiment (Royal Canadians), but an earlier bearer of the number. It, too, was closely identified with Canada, while remaining always Irish. On that famous day of October 1805, just about the hours when, far away, the great naval action was being fought, large part of it perished off the Newfoundland coast on its way from England to Quebec in one of the worst storms on record. This, it was afterwards conjectured, was the same storm which later on scattered the ships that survived Trafalgar.

P. R. BUTLER.

## Art. 6.—AN AMBASSADOR ON RUSSIA.

*Mission to Moscow.* By Joseph E. Davies. Gollancz. London.

THE appearance of Mr Joseph Davies' report is of great interest : especially to all those who have followed with care, and from its beginning, the course of an enormous political and industrial experiment. For, in the first place, this volume purports to fill an abrupt gap in our knowledge. From at least 1936 onwards, till the date of our own understanding with Russia, it was the object of the Soviet Government to impose, as far as possible, an embargo on the emission of all, save the scantiest of purely official, information from within its frontiers. This policy it now ascribes to apprehension of German espionage and German propaganda.

The origin of Mr Davies' mission was as follows. By November 1936, relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. were somewhat strained. Mr Roosevelt, desirous of improving them, and also of obtaining further light on Russia's internal situation, selected, for the post of Ambassador to Moscow, a friend of long standing, in the person of Mr Davies.

Mr Davies, though not what the U.S.A. describes as a 'career diplomatist,' possessed special qualifications for this task. A lawyer and a business man, once Commissioner of Corporations, and Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, he was specially competent to report on Russia's legal system and industrial expansion ; while a forthcoming, tolerant, and likeable disposition was calculated to conciliate Russian sympathies.

And finally, so Mr Davies tells us, he started with a predisposition in favour of Russia. A formidable neighbour, her territorial interests had never conflicted with those of the U.S.A. ; while in possible circumstances of friction with Japan she might prove a formidable ally.

Moreover, he had derived, from a mother whom he describes as a 'Minister of the Gospel,' an inclination to regard Communism in the abstract as a laudable and Christian ideal ; an ideal, however, which human imperfection must postpone for 'æons of generations' ; and

would, he thought, be best pursued through the gradual evolution of American 'democracy.'

It will thus be seen that the 'ideal' Communism of Mr Davies has little in common with the Militant Communism of Marxian Bolshevism. In fact, the Communist sympathies of Mr Davies seem to resolve themselves into a belief that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are specially concerned for the welfare of the 'common man.' This, with an enthusiastic admiration for Russian art and for her literature (as translated), sufficed to render his initial attitude towards the Soviet system one of real, if critical, benevolence.

Those who approach this monumental work—four hundred pages of compressed and small type—will do well to pass, from the Introduction, to the Reports which occupy pages 243-269; and which are dated June 6, 1938—the day of his departure from Russia. For these passages express succinctly his preliminary outlook and his final conclusions. The intervening pages, being excerpts from his contemporary diaries, dispatches and correspondence, give in minute, and sometimes lively, detail his passing experiences and conclusions; and while they obviously aim at 'telling the truth, and nothing but the truth,' they cannot of course profess to convey to us 'the whole truth' even as it then appeared to him. Such a task, impossible even for the confidential despatches of the most outspoken among American diplomats, was still further impeded by the activities of the Secret Police. Foreign representatives in Moscow, so he tells us, even before entering into conversation, always removed the telephone receiver from its base. It usually contained the dictaphone of the G.P.U.

We too shall follow our own advice and start with page 243.

After a brief summary of the vastness and complexity of the Russian problem, Mr Davies turns to her material aspects.

The agricultural wealth of the Union he regards as inexhaustible. Russia, as early as 1935, had produced approximately one-third of the world's wheat crop, one-half of the world's oat crop, 80 per cent. of the world's rye crop, one-fourth of the world's cotton crop; and was first in the world's production of sugar beet, exceeding

thus Germany's contemporary yield by 20 per cent. The mechanisation of farming was then continuing apace; and vast regions, along the route of the Trans-Siberian railway and elsewhere, were being reclaimed for agriculture.

The struggle of which these attainments were the issue had indeed been a vital one. On the success of the agricultural programme had depended, says Mr Davies, the whole fate, not only of the accompanying Industrial Plan, but also of the Party itself. Of the methods employed, however, Mr Davies writes with a severity which will be endorsed by all who know the facts; excepting only those fanatics who remain callous to the sufferings of all who do not share their creed. His definition of the 'Kulaks' indeed, as 'bourgeois' or 'large' land holders, shows the influence of Soviet propaganda; since all such had been exterminated, exiled, enslaved, or beggared much earlier in the day. But he concludes that the victory of the Government had only been secured 'at terrific cost of life.'

Turning next to the Mineral Wealth of the country, Mr Davies finds himself inclined to discount the very grandiose totals of official statistics; which claimed for Russia, in the case of many minerals, the richest deposits of the world. But despite this probable exaggeration, Mr Davies does not doubt that her mineral reserves are enormous. Figures concerning the gold industry, in which Mr Stalin is known to take a particular interest, are a State secret; but foreign authorities are convinced that as regards gold output the Soviet Union ranks second in the world. To sum up, Mr Davies concludes that Russia and the U.S.A. are the only powers almost entirely self-supporting, as far as raw materials are concerned. In some respects their supplies are complementary; together they would form a bloc completely self-sufficient.

As regards Industrial Production, Mr Davies was greatly impressed by the excellence of Russia's industrial instalments and methods, and her provision for scientific study and research. The best possible value had been obtained in foreign services and machinery; yet 75 per cent. of the new equipment was attributable to the new Soviet plants, distinguished no less by number than by size.

At the same time a new race of native Russian managers and experts was evolving, earnest, industrious, and intelligent; recruited mainly from the more active and ambitious among the younger peasantry; highly trained in Russian technical schools and 'finished' abroad.

In fine, Mr Davies considered that, as respects apparatus and managing personnel, Russia, in 1937, after a mere ten years of effort, stood where the U.S.A. had stood sixty years before, after the struggle of several generations.

As regards results, however, Mr Davies was less eulogistic. The Soviet Government indeed claimed that as regards general output, and also many subsidiary branches, the U.S.S.R. stood first in Europe. Mr Davies, on the other hand, while he gave the Government credit for an immense amount of serviceable product, pronounced that the efficiency of its working methods could not compare with the efficiency attained by capitalist countries in general, and the U.S.A. in particular. The difference between the two totals he estimated at 40 per cent. On the question of quality he is silent; though up to 1936, at any rate, this had been very seriously questioned.

But Mr Davies' criticisms did not end here. Soviet industry, impelled, he said, by alternate policies of ruthlessness and conciliation, had attained its successes by a complete abandonment, and indeed reversal, of its own basic principles. Party and Government had become increasingly motivated, not by Communist ideals, but by an instinct of self-preservation; since their continuance in power—and we may add, their very existence—must ultimately depend on making good the promises doled out to the proletariat, in return for the 'tightening of belts.' Success he said had demanded a marked and continuing departure in practice from Communist theory. The profit motive had been found to be the only insistent and constant stimulus; and through the Stakhanovite movement, piece-work and speeding up had become national policies. Such 'quantitative' success as the Five Year Plan had attained had been gained not *through* Government operation of Industry, but *in spite of it*. The vast natural wealth of the country had alone saved the situation, despite the 'enormous insufficiencies,

wastes, and losses' which such a system must entail. What then had Mr Stalin done? Just this; *Conceived the Plan and driven it through.*

Meanwhile he considered fallacious even the Soviet claim to have 'liquidated' unemployment. Doubtless there remained an insatiable demand for Russia's skilled labour. But what of the many compelled to toil at uncongenial tasks, in circumstances much inferior to that of Americans, when working for Unemployment Relief Funds? What of the hordes of political prisoners, enrolled by the million in forced labour gangs? Were they, he asks, from their own point of view, beneficially employed?

As regards finance, Mr Davies was informed that between 1913 and 1935 the national income had more than tripled; and that all of this increment—mainly derived, we may add, from severe indirect taxation, which applied directly, or indirectly, to the 'betterment of the bore very hardly on a poorly paid population—had been working class.' In fact, however, during the three years 1934 to 1937, 'social expenditure' was reported to have risen from 6.4 per cent. to 27 per cent. of the whole; while the proportion assigned to military preparation had risen from 3.3 per cent. to 22 per cent.

Mr Davies' statistics, we repeat, are necessarily Russian and 'official.' Such statistics, in the earlier days of Soviet rule, were notoriously unreliable. Many of the causes for this may by now have ceased to operate. The Russian, however, like all Totalitarian Governments, remains exposed to the severest of all statistical temptations; it can represent its own case without fear of counter-check. On the whole, however, Mr Davies' final verdict may be accepted as probable, namely, that such statistics were then 'fairly reliable'; and that even allowing a substantial, or indeed a large, discount from the totals, the achievement remained most impressive.

From the economic Mr Davies passes to assess the political situation.

Among the 'strengths' of the Russian administration he enumerated first the existence of a strong and closely knit political framework. At the top of the political hierarchy, from the inmost recesses of the Kremlin, ruled Mr Stalin, whose domination over the whole remained

supreme. Next to him in practice stood his principal lieutenants—the heads of the Army, of the Secret Police, and of the Transport and Food Control Departments. Beneath these again, with a membership of eleven, came the Politbureau, or Supreme Council of the Communist Party; while under all these, and in complete dependence upon them, functioned the Governments of the Russian Socialist Republics and the bureaucratic apparatus of the U.S.S.R. The system, as he says, represented, not the Rule of the Proletariat, but a Rule over the Proletariat; and it is significant that, in this connection, he does not even mention the then new Assemblies or Parliament, of which he had attended the first, and very picturesque, sitting.

The members of the supreme group he describes as determined, ruthless, and very hard-working. This last perhaps accounts for the fact that all of them who had reached middle life—Mr Stalin included—were believed to suffer from ‘tired hearts.’

The private lives of these satraps were reputed to be ‘clean’ and relatively simple. ‘It is generally admitted,’ says Mr Davies, that ‘there is no graft in high places.’ In the Kremlin, and in their own ‘dachas’ or country villas, at which he was sometimes entertained, they lived comfortably but not ostentatiously. Their emoluments, it was said, never exceeded three hundred roubles a month; but as ‘everything is provided by the State,’ says Mr Davies, ‘they do not need money.’

The motives which inspired these men were presumably mixed. Under any despotic system, where not only Power but Life and Liberty are at stake, self-preservation must always play a large part; but Mr Davies says they were credited with ‘a sincere and fanatical devotion to the Communist cause.’

This Communism, however, by Mr Davies’ own showing, was not the Communism of Marx, of Lenin, or of the ‘old brigade’; i.e. it was not the Communism which Party Propaganda then preached, and no doubt still preaches intact, at home and abroad. For, one by one, those ideals and those doctrines, and the individuals who clung to them, have been perforce sacrificed on the altars of Necessity, Expediency, or Human Nature. That to which the Communists of 1937–38 stood pledged



was in fact this : a system of despotic State Socialism, wherein all actual power vested in a self-appointed autocracy, uncontrolled by any form of organised opposition. For the final Terror was disposing of all the previously remaining 'old Bolsheviks,' whether of the Right or Left movements; and was leaving the system dependent on the support of the Party rank and file, and on the fidelity of the G.P.U. and the Army.

The G.P.U., including its military branch of two hundred thousand, with Police and Detective Forces of unknown proportions, was regarded as 'devotedly loyal' to the Autocrat; while the Army, writes Mr Davies in 1938—i.e. after the Great Purge—was also reputed 'loyal'; or, alternatively, was presumed to be 'well in hand.' To-day, thanks to Mr Stalin's judiciously-timed emphasis on the patriotic motive, and to the age-long hatred of the Slav for the Teuton, no one doubts that the Army is passionately devoted to the National Cause, and to Mr Stalin, its representative.

Our author's estimate of Russia's military preparations was in general high; he believed that the 'liquidation' of the principal generals had reacted on the Army less deleteriously than had been supposed; and he had a strong belief in Russia's capacity for self-defence. He thought her capable of maintaining herself against any possible alliance of two Powers; as against the combination of three she might lose ground, but not, he thought, permanently.

On the other hand Mr Davies detected in the Russian political situation various elements of weakness.

On the whole, he thought that the many varieties of race and language, traditions and outlook, which coexisted within the scope of a single authority, must threaten the solidarity or even the cohesion of the U.S.S.R. As against this, indeed, he laid stress on the increasing attention paid by the Moscow Government to local interests and cultures; and the unifying tendency of increased means of inter-communication.

As regards general policy, however, he thought that the attempt to found a State and Society on the elimination of personal interest must ultimately fail. Unless within a couple of generations primary instincts can be stamped out the Soviet experiment stood foredoomed.

Again, he dwelt on the ultimate impossibility of conducting the entire life of a community by means of a bureaucratic nexus. He was further impressed by the latent, but permanent, conflict between the village and the town, the first so continuously exploited through the other. In Russian inertia and fatalism, again, he discovered a constant 'drag' upon progress; and he saw, in the ever present 'fluidity' of labour, signs of a possible inability among predominantly agricultural peoples for persistent mechanico-industrial employment. The difficulties inherent in any system of statutory wage-fixing seemed to him almost insuperable; and he foresaw a possibility that the younger men might be rendered restless by the contrast between Communism's promises and performance, and the pendulum might therefore swing towards a more individualistic creed.

The prevalent 'tyranny and oppression,' specially embodied in the G.P.U., offered, he considered, a special menace to the future of the whole Soviet Union. For while he thought the contemporary 'purges,' as affecting mainly members of 'the Party,' were regarded with indifference, or even with covert satisfaction, by the general public, the 'Panic,' to which these 'purges' bore witness, betrayed a sense of insecurity in the leaders of the Party themselves. For 'no physical betterment of living,' he writes, 'could possibly compensate for the utter destruction of . . . liberty of thought and speech, and the sanctity of the individual.'

But he saw the supreme danger, to the Party itself, as latent in the entire lack of any religious bond within it. For Communism sanctions all deeds—and those only—which subserve the interest of Communism as a whole; and this, he maintains, destroys all links of morality and loyalty, as between man and man. No one in the Party, he says, dared trust his comrade.

Others of his forebodings have been disproved by time. His belief that a foreign war might give occasion to a rising of malcontents has proved totally misleading; and anticipations of possible *coups d'état*, or assassinations, have been similarly discounted.

On the whole, however, his final forecasts were rather favourable than the reverse. No *coup d'état* indeed, he believed, could abolish State Socialism; but he saw in

the future a possibility that the existing regime might in the long run move gradually toward the Right, and might, while still professing Communism, eventuate in a compromise. In this, Big Industry alone might be controlled by the State; leaving Agriculture and Small Industry to function 'under capitalist property-and-profit principles.'

As regards international problems, Mr Davies saw some risk to Russia in the latent hostility of States adjacent to her; who, upon economic, religious and political grounds, greatly feared the 'penetration and extension of the Soviet system.' These fears he does not seem to criticise; but he appears to regard Western Europe—and even ourselves—merely as 'reactionary.' Obsessed by the importance of the U.S.S.R., he inclined to mistrust us, as too complacent to Hitlerite encroachment; and, in practice, not ill pleased with the idea of Russian isolation. For, believing as he did, probably with truth, that the Stalin of 1938-39 considered the Comintern as a military or political and not a propaganda asset, Mr Davies shows scant understanding of the extent and revolutionary virulence of Communist interference in the past; and scant sympathy for its effects on the countries so long exposed to its disruptive influence.

But if Mr Davies did less than justice to the Western Powers in this respect, he was no doubt urged by a justifiable anxiety. More clearly than any European statesman, Mr Churchill alone excepted, he saw the imminence of the World Peril, implied in the common ambitions of Germany and Japan. Even in such a conflict, Russia, he felt, could hold her own. But in a triumphant Russia, isolated by European mistrust, he saw an overwhelming menace, both to world economics and world policies. On the other hand the contingency—he then believed the remote contingency—of a Russo-German coalition, whether enforced by conquest or cemented by alliance, caused him apprehensions even more acute. German method, scientific and industrial, German discipline, and German managerial capacity—all these applied to Russia's illimitable resources, seemed to him the last word in conceivable World Disaster.

So much for Mr Davies' conclusions and anticipations. Let us now revert for a brief glance or two at the (often

vivid) contemporary records which form the body of the work ; wherein solemn diplomatic reports jostle life-like pictures of his new environment.

It is easy to see that Mr Davies thoroughly appreciated this Russian interlude, and credits Moscow with supplying 'never a dull moment.' This, despite the discomforts of diplomatic life in the capital, on which Mr Litvinov, in a farewell apology, feelingly enlarged, as 'intolerable.' In what this 'intolerableness' consisted neither explains. But we meet incidental references to insalubrious food supplies ; to a dearth of all social intercourse, save that supplied by official and diplomatic circles ; to the complete absence of foreign news ; and to the unremitting assiduity of Soviet espionage services.

He had, however, many compensations. He was thrilled by the magnificence of the Russian drama, opera and ballet—the '*Circenses*' which lend their flavour to Russia's '*panis*.' He enjoyed the brilliant official banquets, sumptuous as those Imperial receptions, whose halls and whose treasures they inherited. The barbaric splendours of the Kremlin palaces enchanted him ; Russian sculpture and Russian painting called forth his highest encomiums ; and he became an ardent collector of Russian works of art, ancient, mediæval and modern.

His official labours meanwhile were of constant, if sometimes sombre, interest. Great political trials took place during his years of office ; and though shocked in every fibre of his legal conscience by the absence of all legal safeguards for the accused, Mr Davies formed an opinion (shared, he says, by his diplomatic colleagues) that the convictions so obtained were not unjust. Our last four years, by the evidence they have afforded as to German and Japanese methods of penetration and seduction, lend indeed a certain sinister probability to the charges, for which the victims suffered ; and Mr Davies considers this argument all-sufficient. But he seems to ignore four important factors in the problem. He appears to have been unacquainted with Russian methods of obtaining those confessions, on which he lays such stress. Moreover there is strong reason to believe that Gestapo officials were not above constructing, and 'planting' on G.P.U. agents, evidence condemnatory of persons who were regarded as dangerous to Germany.

Again, 'purges' and 'terrors' provided a ghastly hunting-ground for revenge, jealousy and ambition. And in the last place the appalling extent of the holocausts must tell against the guilt of a very large proportion of the victims. For in any European country the real 'Quislings'—those who have come forward with Germany in the ascendant—have always proved few.

His visits to the provinces, if of less poignant interest, gained him much valuable information. His appendices prove the thoroughness of his industrial investigations, and will be welcomed by those in search of technical enlightenment. But we find too little of that more intimate detail concerning the state of the people, supplied by Sir Walter Citrine's classic work, which is duly eulogised in Mr Davies' pages. He comments on the low 'cost' of Russian labour, but thought the man in the street much more warmly clothed than he expected; while Mr Kalinin satisfied him that the vast and insistent demand for more 'consumers goods,' which was still a feature of Russian life, was being satisfied as rapidly as circumstances permitted.

The social life of Moscow, though so restricted in scope, afforded Mr Davies and his family both interest and amusement. With his colleagues of the Diplomatic Corps he seems to have remained on consistently genial terms; while official Russia was at his feet. Its representatives went out of their way to evince appreciation of U.S.A. advances in general, and of the Ambassador in particular. He was royally entertained, and reciprocated in kind.

His most intimate relations were necessarily with Mr Litvinov, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, who, moreover, was married to a 'charming English woman'—a sister of Mr Davies' old friend, Sir Sidney Lowe. Mr Davies describes his 'opposite number' as by common consent 'the ablest Foreign Minister in Europe,' and Mr Litvinov's eulogistic review of Mr Davies' book appears on the jacket of the volume.

The titular President of the Union, Mr. Kalinin, who had started life in a foundry, Mr Davies considers 'a fine type' with 'serious eyes.' He thought him 'a kind good man . . . very able in a simple way'—and 'very popular.' A peasant by origin, he would still visit his

aged mother in the country, and eat out of her dish, to show that he was not 'stuck up.' Questioned as to her icons, he would answer that 'he did not mind them'; they had 'served a good purpose with his fathers before him' and 'he didn't think they did him any harm.' A suggestive speech, as Mr Davies comments.

Apart from these two and the Premier, Mr Molotov—whose wife, we are interested to learn, was Commissar of Cosmetics—the remaining Commissars seem all to have been of a different calibre. They did not belong to the more 'intellectual' school of Lenin or Trotsky, but rather represented a tougher and more practical type, which had done the rougher work of the revolution. These included Mr Kaganovitch of the Transport, Stalin's brother-in-law, who shot engine-drivers after collisions 'pour encourager les autres'; Marshal Voroshilov, the great guerilla leader, Stalin's closest associate in the Old Civil War, etc., etc. With all these Mr Davies seems to have lived on easy terms; so Moscow, in those days of 'panics,' 'shootings,' and 'terrors,' showed her smoothest side to Mr Davies and the Embassy in general.

The culminating point of his diplomatic career, however, was attained in his Farewell Interview with Mr Stalin himself.

Its importance lay not so much in its detail, as to which Mr Davies is discreetly noncommittal, as in the very fact of its occurrence. It was apparently the first interview ever vouchsafed by the recluse of the Kremlin to any foreign diplomatist; and the concession to the U.S.A., and its representative, of so unique a distinction, 'almost stunned' the whole diplomatic corps.

It took place on June 5, 1938, while Mr Davies was visiting the Kremlin to take leave of President Kalinin and the Premier. He had just entered the President's apartment—in the 'very beautiful yellow and white Catherine Palace' which forms part of the Kremlin buildings—when a door at the further end of the room opened and Mr Stalin came in.

Mr Davies admits that he was struck dumb with astonishment. 'He was,' he tells us, 'shorter than I had conceived and . . . quite slight in appearance. He greeted me cordially and with a smile. . . . His manner is almost deprecatingly simple,' though not without 'a real dignity.'



In his personality Mr Davies seemed to detect 'an impression of reserve strength and poise, very marked; and signs of a strong mind . . . composed and wise. . . . His brown eyes' (he considered) 'exceedingly kindly and gentle. A child would like to sit in his lap and a dog would sidle up to him.'

The talk which ensued lasted two hours, and though of course mainly directed towards the questions at issue between the two Unions, it seems to have covered a wide range. Mr Stalin, for instance, censured the 'reactionary' elements in England, represented by Chamberlain. He also declared that the Soviet Union had every confidence in its own power of self-defence. Mr Davies, on his side, appears to have grasped this surprising opportunity of expressing, in frank terms, the points of view of Capitalism, and the aims of its most liberal exponents, and dilated on the amount of American income which taxation transfers into the pockets of 'the less privileged.' Stalin he thought, seemed surprised and impressed.

The whole discussion, says Mr Davies, 'was really an intellectual treat which we all enjoyed. . . . Throughout . . . we joked and laughed at times. He has a sly humour and a very great mentality; it is sharp, shrewd, and above all things wise, at least so it would appear to me.'

We are not therefore surprised to learn that Mr Davies found it 'difficult to associate this personality . . . with the purges and shootings of the Red Army Generals and so forth . . . they are just as far apart as the poles.'

Perhaps we may reasonably suspect that no man was ever less calculated to explore the remote recesses of that inscrutable Georgian mind than our amiable American. Mr Davies was indeed ultimately to accept, without reserve, the plea of Russian apologists that such things 'had to be done to protect themselves from Germany'; but at the time he could only take refuge in the age-worn plea of fanaticism. 'Men,' he says, 'will do for . . . a cause things they would never do otherwise.'

The axiom is almost a platitude. But unfortunately for his argument, fanaticism is probably the last characteristic which those who have known him long would associate with the most 'realistic' of Dictators.

H. C. FOXCROFT.



## Art. 7.—WITCHCRAFT.

1. *The Witch-Cult in Western Europe*. By Margaret Alice Murray. Clarendon Press. 1921.
2. *A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718*. By Wallace Notestein. Washington: American Historical Association. 1911.
3. *Witchcraft*. By Charles Williams. Faber & Faber, Ltd. 1941.
4. *A Popular History of Witchcraft*. By Montague Summers. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. 1937.

To how many people does the word 'witch' convey more than an ugly hag, a shrivelled crone, avoided for the most part by her village neighbours in whom she inspired an unreasoning fear as she croaked her maledictions against them or hobbled muttering past their doors? It was such helpless, and often half-witted, old women who were tied to ducking-stools and dipped in local ponds. Along with such a picture of real dames may be associated in our minds grotesque stories of the traditional broomstick whereon the witch flew through the air and of the black cat which accompanied her on her journeys. This is probably the sum-total of our knowledge of a fantastic subject.

If, however, we pursue the matter a little, two facts soon make us pause. The first is the long list of books, by authors of some repute, on various aspects of witchcraft. Though some of these belong to bygone generations, not a few are of recent date and appear in publishers' current catalogues. This, in itself, constitutes no proof that witchcraft was an expression of anything other than ignorance or deception; for it is astonishing on what preposterous subjects intelligent people will spend time and labour in writing books. Nevertheless such a list does suggest at least that there is much more to be known about witches than we might have expected. The second fact is that men of outstanding and even brilliant intelligence were once convinced of the reality of witchcraft. This, again, does not prove that the belief of such men was right; for the opinions of a genius are notoriously untrust-

worthy when he strays outside his own specialist sphere. But when men as different in type as Francis Bacon the legal philosopher, Robert Boyle the scientist, John Selden the Parliamentary leader, and John Wesley the genius of the evangelical revival, agree that witches did exert real and malign powers, we do well to hesitate before scoffing at their views as merely absurd, especially when we remember that these men had personal contact with witches and their craft in a way that is not available to us.

In order to shape, even tentatively, our notions on the subject, some recollection of the known facts and history of witchcraft is essential.

## I

Perhaps we may best begin with this fundamental fact : a witch was not an isolated old crone who merely preyed upon the superstitious susceptibilities of her ignorant neighbours. On the contrary, she belonged to a highly organised fraternity whose rules and procedure were uniform, save for local details, not only throughout England but throughout Western Europe.

The unit of the organisation was the coven which consisted normally of thirteen persons, namely, twelve witches (men or women) belonging to one locality, and their officer who in turn was responsible to the Grand Master. One of the officer's chief functions was to exercise a strict, even relentless, discipline over his members. Meetings of the coven were of two types, the esbat and the sabbat. The esbat appears to have been a secret gathering attended only by those members who performed the cult's characteristic rites, including those connected with the initiation of new members. The crux of the initiation ceremony was the candidate's oath to dedicate herself (or himself) to the service of the Devil and her renunciation of the God she had hitherto served. At the sabbat all members, and even non-members, could be present. The meetings took place at night in some secluded place—a wood or a heath—though not uncommonly the esbat was held in the house of one of the members. The climax of the ceremonies was worship of the Devil who was the witches' god and was represented by some individual usually

arrayed as an animal, though sometimes appearing undisguised. To him the witches had to give an account of the evil they had been able to contrive since their previous meeting. Obeisance to the Devil was followed by a feast and by foully obscene ceremonies and practices.

For the carrying-out of many of the evil designs against individuals, the witch was reputed to rely upon her familiar. Usually this was some animal that she had received from the Devil at her initiation, or had inherited from her mother (since witch-mothers invariably taught their craft to their children), or had been given by a fellow-witch. The familiar might be almost any small animal, most commonly, perhaps, a cat (hence presumably the black cat popularly associated with witches), or a toad which was kept on wool in a covered pot near the hearth.

The fact that a witch systematically instructed her children in witchcraft disposes of another common but erroneous idea, namely, that a witch was always an aged person. Among the most famous witch-trials in the history of the craft in England were those of the Lancashire witches in 1612 and in 1633-34. The case arose through the activities of two rival families of witches. The families were headed by Mother Demdike and Mother Chattox respectively, each of whom had instructed her children, and Mother Demdike had even instructed her grandchildren, in the evil art. Most of the nineteen people put on trial in 1612 (ten of whom were executed) must therefore have been middle-aged or younger. Evidence at other trials shows that the Lancashire witches were not at all exceptional in this respect.

When the witch was first accepted by the Devil, she was supposed to receive from him on some part of her body a mark, which might be a coloured spot, that she ever afterwards retained and that was insensible to pain. Neither pinching nor pricking on the mark could be felt by the witch. Or the mark might be that strange phenomenon of a supplementary nipple. The detecting and testing of the 'witch's mark' or the 'devil's mark' was accepted by the law-courts as the surest evidence that the prisoner was a veritable witch.

Further, the witches were believed to have, and believed themselves to have, intercourse with demons, incubi, and succubæ (which a modern dictionary defines

as : *incubus*, an evil spirit supposed to descend on sleeping persons ; *succuba*, a female demon having sexual intercourse with sleeping men).

What proportion of the witches believed in the reality of the Devil's presence and of the spirit-world of evil of which they were the accredited agents is a matter of extreme difficulty to determine and about which only a rash man would dogmatise. Almost certainly some witches were deliberate charlatans. But, equally, others (perhaps the subjects of hallucinations) were utterly sincere : the final proof of the genuineness of their convictions was that many went willingly to the stake glorying in their faith and declaring their devotion to their god. They were martyrs as truly as the Christians who in all ages have allowed themselves to be sacrificed rather than deny their faith.

There are three main sources of information available to us concerning the witches and their craft, namely, contemporary writings on the subject, incidental references in general contemporary literature, and evidence at witch-trials in the law courts.

One of the earliest important writers on witchcraft was Reginald Scot, of Scots-Hall in Kent, and formerly a student at Oxford, who in 1584 published the 'Discoverie of Witchcraft.' He exposed what he regarded as the humbug that was allowed to pass as evidence in many trials and inveighed against the pretended powers of the witches whom he characterised as 'doting scolds, mad, divelish.' In 1597 James VI of Scotland published his 'Dæmonologie' which controverted Scot and asserted the power of witchcraft. The most effective advocate of witchcraft's reality was Joseph Glanvill who in 1666 published his 'Philosophical Considerations touching Witches and Witchcraft.' The book passed through several editions and in 1681 (the year following Glanvill's death) appeared as 'Sadducismus Triumphatus,' that is, 'Unbelief Vanquished.' These books are typical of many, some defending witchcraft and others condemning it, some regarding its powers as real though evil and others declaring the whole business to be a fraud. Whatever we may think of their respective views, they afford us valuable information of the practices connected with their theme.

The references to witchcraft in general contemporary

literature are scarcely less valuable than those in books written specifically on the subject. That such references are incidental and indirect makes them perhaps more reliable than if they were deliberate statements of advocates or of opponents. The best known is in the opening act of Shakespeare's 'Macbeth.' In Scene I two of the three witches in 'a desert place' are summoned respectively by graymalkin (a common name for a cat) and by paddock (a toad), both of which creatures were regarded as witches' familiars. In Scene III the Second Witch had been 'killing swine,' that is, in typical witch-fashion, had been 'overlooking' animals; while the First Witch, having been rebuffed by a sailor's wife, explained her scheme to sail 'in a sieve' and plague the woman's sailor-husband by raising winds to blow from every quarter so as to hinder his sleep and to prevent his entering port—all of which powers the witches were supposed to possess. Evidently Shakespeare was thoroughly conversant with witchcraft tradition and knew that his audience would be also.

The kind of information to be gained from our third source, namely, the evidence—much of it given by witches themselves—at law-court trials during the later sixteenth century and the seventeenth century, will appear in our review of the history of the cult.

## II

Condemnatory references to witchcraft appear early in English history. Theodore, who was Archbishop of Canterbury during the years 668-690, forbade 'serving this hidden idolatry, having relinquished Christ' in terms that leave no doubt that he was referring to a form of witchcraft. In the following century Ecgberht, the first Archbishop of York (734-766), expressly forbade making offerings to devils and witchcraft. King Cnut, three centuries later, issued a decree in similar terms. During the Middle Ages, trials for witchcraft were the province of the Church. Not until the reign of Henry VIII did witchcraft become a statutory offence. A Statute of 1542 made the 'invocations and conjurations of sprites' a felony. This Statute, along with other felony-Acts, was repealed in the first year of Edward VI; but under

Elizabeth, in 1563, a new Statute enacted that anyone who

'shall use, practise, or exercise any Witchcraft, Enchantment, Charme or Sorcerie, whereby any person shall happen to be killed or destroyed . . . shall suffer paynes of Deathe as a Felon'

and that when such practices should have a result less serious than death to the victim they should be punishable by imprisonment and the pillory. Under the terms of the 1563 Act, at least fifty people are known to have been executed.

James I's belief in the powers of witchcraft showed itself almost immediately after his accession to the English throne: a Statute of 1604 repealed the 1563 Statute and substituted the more comprehensive provision that anyone who

'shall use . . . any Invocacion or Conjuracion of any evill and wicked Spirit, or shall consult any evill and wicked Spirit . . . ; shall suffer death as a felon.'

During James I's twenty-two years as King of England about a hundred cases were brought before the courts under the terms of this Act; and of these, one-half resulted in executions. The farcical nature of the evidence adduced at some of the trials, and the confessions of fraud by some of the principal participants, caused James gradually to revise his views, so that during the closing years of his reign he came to regard the whole business of witchcraft as a cheat. This view was shared by his son Charles I during whose reign, until the outbreak of the Civil War, there is evidence for not more than half-a-dozen executions for witchcraft.

During the disturbed period of the Civil War, Commonwealth, and Protectorate, witchcraft trials ebbed and flowed. Charles II's restoration saw a violent recurrence of anti-witchcraft activity: but during the latter part of his reign convictions became more and more rare, and the last execution for witchcraft in England took place at Exeter in 1682. The Surrey Assizes were the last to convict an accused witch. But Judge Powell who tried the case sympathised with the prisoner: having caustically remarked, in reference to one of the charges against her, that flying was not an offence in English law, he took

appropriate action to secure her pardon. The 1604 Act was not repealed until 1736, but long before that it had been a dead letter.

The decline in the number of witch-trials, and finally the repeal of the 1604 Act, were not due to any change in the views of the masses of the people. The judges had learned to mistrust much of the evidence submitted at trials and to regard prisoners accused of witchcraft as either crazy or the victims of persecution ; but the general populace retained almost undiminished its belief in the effectiveness of the witches' powers for evil. Accordingly, when the law ceased to attack the Devil's emissaries, the people became a law unto themselves. Many an aged woman was subjected to ordeal by water : with thumbs and great toes tied together—left thumb to right toe, and right thumb to left toe—the helpless woman was flung into the nearest pond. If she floated she was guilty ; if she sank she was innocent. That so many floated was doubtless due more to the natural tendency of a body thus shaped than to the victim's occult powers. The innocent who sank did not necessarily drown : a rope tied round the waist often enabled her to be hauled to the bank, not infrequently to die afterwards from the results of exposure. Nor did the convict who floated necessarily suffer further violence : her real punishment was that henceforward everyone knew for certain that she was in league with the Devil and treated her accordingly.

### III

It is impossible to read the accounts of the witch-trials without concluding, as latterly the judges concluded, that most of the evidence put forward by witnesses was wholly unreliable and prejudiced, while much of the evidence of the witches themselves was given for the sake of notoriety. Yet when every deduction on such scores has been made, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that there remains a residuum of fact not easy to account for. One of the questions continually rising in the inquirer's mind is how the elaborate system originated. In this connection, two factors particularly present themselves : first, the antiquity of the craft ; and second, the universalism of the craft's ceremonies and practices.



As to the first factor, we have seen that witchcraft existed in England from the earliest days of Christianity in the Island. As witchcraft was certainly not derived from Christianity—their bases and outlooks being diametrically opposite—the inevitable deduction seems to be that witchcraft had existed in England prior to Christianity. Hence has arisen the idea that witchcraft was the survival of a pre-Christian religious cult that continued long after Christianity had been accepted as the religion of the country. A reasonable explanation of this fact—if fact it be—is not difficult to see. When Christianity was first introduced, only the rulers and the relatively enlightened few were in any real sense converted to the new faith. The masses of ignorant folk still clung to their traditional cult whatever their outward profession might be. Though the masses might please their rulers by accepting Christian baptism, in reality they were of the same opinion still. The old dark fear still held them in its grip; the scenes of their former worship were still haunted by the Devil; and when, four times a year, the regular seasons of the sabbats drew round, the people went out at night, one by one, and half-ashamed, to the accustomed ceremonies. So the old sinister worship of the powers of Evil continued, degenerating, as time passed, in many of its particulars but always retaining its essential entity. There is some possibility that the cult was closely connected with the religion of the Druids who are believed to have indulged in human sacrifices (just as the witches sacrificed infants) and to have practised divination (by observing the habits of animals) and sorcery generally. These resemblances between the two cults may be coincidences only, but they are at least highly suggestive of the kind of connection that witchcraft may have had with some earlier religion, if not that of the Druids. The adoption of the two religions side by side is not without its parallels in the story of mankind. The history of the people of Israel, for example, shows the worship of Baal side by side with that of Jehovah which produced the process commonly known as syncretism.

This theory goes far to explain the other factor already mentioned, namely, that witchcraft's main ceremonies and practices were alike throughout England and even in

western Europe. Also, since witchcraft was in essence Devil-worship, this would be in keeping with the religions of primitive peoples not only in Europe but the world over.

Further, no matter how our reason may scoff at the follies and frauds of witchcraft, we may do well to hesitate before we pooh-pooh the whole subject as so much impossible rubbish. What the English witches claimed to be able to do can be watched still among primitive peoples in many parts of the world. Travellers who have experience of African tribes, though they set out with no prejudice in favour of the 'spirits,' often end with having an open mind on the subject. A missionary who has watched an African priest call a teeming multitude of sacred crocodiles from their pool and keep them under spell while the pool is being cleaned, only afterwards allowing them to return to it, may be forgiven if, when asked about the Africans' religion, he replies that there may be 'something in it.' He will agree, of course, that whatever there is 'in it' is derived from evil Devils and not from a good God—and that was precisely the essence of the witches' worship also.

As an explanation of witches' supposed contacts with incubi and succubæ (condemned as long ago as 1484 by the Papal Bull of Innocent VIII) the theory has been advanced that they may have a counterpart in the ectoplasm observed in a modern Spiritualist séance. This theory, it is contended, would explain the Demon's coldness to the touch, to which the witches invariably referred at their trials.

The most famous case in western Europe of trial for witchcraft was that of Joan of Arc. There can be no doubt that, whether in reality she was a witch or not, the court that tried her regarded her as a witch and that she was burned as a witch. In the court's view, the Voices which she claimed to hear were familiars, and the court was adopting the orthodox view in urging that her Voices and the Faith of Holy Church could not both be true. Joan asserted that they were both true, which was equivalent to maintaining two religions side by side. Her judges applied the test that was invariably applied to witches, namely, that she should repeat the Lord's Prayer (for the common belief was that no witch could say the Prayer

through), and she refused to repeat it. Her dressing in boy's clothes was significant to her judges because it suggested the sort of disguise usual among witches. That Joan, faced with the prospect of the stake, recanted her faith in her Voices and later withdrew her recantation was interpreted as it would have been with any other accused witch, namely, that in the meantime she had been visited by her familiars, or possibly by the Devil himself, and had therefore reverted to her traditional allegiance. What were Joan's own convictions in the matter we cannot pretend to know; but that her judges were sincere in condemning her is abundantly clear. If the common soldiers of France were equally certain that she was a witch, this would be explanation enough of the transformation that was wrought in them: from being demoralised in anticipation of defeat, they advanced to battle confident of victory, for were they not being led by one who bore the hall-mark of their god, perhaps by the Devil in person? It would be explanation enough, also, of the defeatism that spread among the English soldiers. If this was the conviction of both armies, it seems a clear example of the survival of a primitive cult alongside Christianity.

#### IV

Perhaps the most important of all the questions connected with the subject is the practical question of what effects witchcraft had upon the lives not of the witches themselves but of their fellow men and women.

On occasion, witchcraft had political reactions in the highest Court circles. For example, one of the agents in the poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury in 1613, leading to the fall of the Court favourites the Earl and Countess of Somerset, was Dr Simon Forman, who, thirty years earlier, had started business in London as an astrologer and had built up a clientèle among fashionable Court ladies and gallants who were wont to obtain from him love philtres and the like.

The most notorious of all the witch-trials involving high politics occurred in 1590 when four witches of the North Berwick coven were tried for plotting to murder King James VI of Scotland and his Queen, first by raising a storm at sea and then by the usual method of melting

waxen images of their desired victims. The question of motive at once arose, and it received sufficient answer when investigation showed conclusively that the arch-plotter was the Devil of the coven and no less a person than Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell, eldest son of John Stewart and Jane Hepburn, the latter being sister to the Earl of Bothwell whom Mary Queen of Scots had married. Hence, had the Devil of the North Berwick coven been able to compass the death of the childless James VI, that same Devil would have succeeded to the Scottish throne and ultimately to the English throne also. Barbara Napier, one of the accused witches, thus explicitly elucidated the purpose of the plot: 'that another might have ruled in his Majesty's place, and the government might have gone to the Devil.'

Incidentally, it was while James was examining Anne Sampson, another of the witches concerned in the plot, that he had received what seemed to him irrefutable evidence of the power of witchcraft. Because James had been incredulous of her claims, she is reputed to have taken him aside and then to have

'declared unto him the very words which passed between the king's majesty and his Queen at Oslo in Norway, the first night of their marriage, with their answers each to other: whereat the king's Majesty wondered greatly, and sware by the living God that he believed that all the Devils in hell could not have discovered the same: acknowledging her words to be most true, and therefore gave the more credit to the rest.'

Such incidents and those of the Somersets and of the North Berwick witches were exceptional and affected directly only a small number of people in Court circles. Of far greater importance must have been the effect that witchcraft was exercising continually on the populace as a whole. In the nature of things, this effect was too vague and general to be capable of precise measurement. It may best be gauged by reference to the reaction which devil-worship has upon its devotees as we can still see it elsewhere in the world. The fundamental fact about devil-worship is that it is based upon fear, fear of the devils that are worshipped. And fear always has a repressive effect upon its victims, a coarsening effect which

fosters cruelty on the part of those subject to it. The bully is commonly an individual inspired by fear which he tries to brazen out by torturing those weaker than himself. Is not this a sufficient explanation of the cruelty and brutality which, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, expressed itself in many forms, including the people's brutality against the witches themselves? For the intensity of popular outbursts against the witches was not due to the people's disbelief in them; on the contrary, the hatred constituted the strongest possible evidence of the widespread conviction of their malign powers.

That we draw this conclusion about the reaction of the devil-worship, which was witchcraft, upon the character of the English people is, of course, irrespective of whether devils existed or not. It was not the devils but the belief in devils and in their maleficence that moulded the thinking and the characters of the believers.

It is a strange commentary on the paradoxical make-up of human nature that the seventeenth century, that saw the belief in witchcraft at its height, saw also the great struggle against tyranny in both religion and politics. Yet the two may not be as mutually contrary as at first sight appears. Perhaps the explanation of the paradox is that it was because men were then in deadly earnest about their religion that they were equally ready to give credence to the evil-spirit realm also. Because they were utterly devoted to the Kingdom of God, as they interpreted it, they were bitterly opposed to the Kingdom of the Devil. No matter what is the true interpretation of the phenomena connected with witchcraft, the gradual loosening of its hold upon the mass of the people during the latter half of the eighteenth century must be reckoned as one of the major emancipations of English history.

S. REED BRETT.

## Art. 8.—BRITAIN AT WAR.

'It is curious what irrelevancies come into the mind,' remarked the late Lord Birkenhead as the opening sentence of one of his most audacious after-dinner speeches, that at the centenary dinner of the Law Society: in his case the irrelevancy was 'What a jolly time the ladies are having!'—three or four dinnerless ladies in the gallery watching us men feed; in my case at this juncture of the world's war, with Brazil just added and Uruguay and others also about to step into the ever-enlarging cauldron, the irrelevancy that for days past has been fluttering like a moth around my mind is 'The night is hellish dark and smells o' cheese!'—unless my recollection much misleads me, originally one of the great Doctor's epigrammatic causticisms, though later adopted as his own by one of the clowns at Sanger's circus. An irrelevancy, doubtless, because, though under the administration of Lord Woolton, one of the few Ministers who has by general consent made a success of his job, the cheese ration is ample for all ordinary domestic consumption, the supply is still by no means so abundant as to enable houses or rooms, let alone nights, to smell of it: and yet a continually recurring irrelevancy because no one will deny that the night is, and has been for a good many months, 'hellish dark.'

It was no less an authority than Mr Oliver Lyttelton, speaking with all the impressiveness that naturally appertains, or should appertain, to the utterances of a Minister of Production, who on July 18 declared 'not since the Battle of Britain have we been in greater peril': that seemed at the time, and still seems, one of the rather dramatic exaggerations inseparable from political gingerings-up, but few disputed at the time, and no one will now dispute, that his next sentence about the supreme importance of the next eighty days was fully justified. As I write to-day (August 27) exactly forty of those eighty days have passed into history, during which on and on has gone the immense German rush. It is only possible to gain some mental knowledge of the events crowded into this first half of these eighty days by glancing backward; many events, a number of them of quite tremendous importance, which have taken place since I last wrote on May 11, seem already so long ago that it is indeed hard to

believe how short an actual period of time has gone by since their enactment. And, equally, though so much is still so opaquely obscure, it is certain that the second half of these eighty days will see events of greater and greater magnitude till even what is happening to-day will seem long ago. What, indeed, may not have happened before November 1, when this article sees the light? *Quien sabe?*

The pace of the war, in short, has quickened immeasurably and is already almost commensurate with the world scale; and it is continually increasing. The Battle for Stalingrad thundering throughout our consciousness, felt unceasingly even in quiet country lanes, is, I suppose, one of the greatest, if not actually the greatest, of the battles of all history, and day by day, almost hour by hour the threat to the key-city grows; the drive deep into the Caucasus continues, as yet unarrested, though slowed down; Dieppe rings the challenge of its great raid and its encouragement from here to Canada and beyond; the Solomon Islands reverberate with American energy and Japanese discomfiture; an uneasy heaving troubles all the North African sands; indomitably the Chinese press on towards Chuhsien; everywhere on the seven seas there is grim and relentless strife; and the air is trembling with the rush and fury of planes. And yet all of these activities, as far as the Allies are concerned, betoken aspirations rather than fulfilments, beginnings not conclusions: the might of the British peoples is as a boxer's arm drawn back to strike, a blow impending not yet actually delivered; the momentum of the vastness of the United States is even yet only gathering way.

And here let me voice what is, I know, the ardent wish of many, namely, that we should cease to say, and keep on saying, what we will do—until we have done it. Mr Churchill really began it by his comment upon the great air raids: 'city by city,' Germany was told, she would be destroyed. Then the Service chiefs took up the tale, first Sir Charles Portal and then Sir Arthur Harris, and finally, to date, Sir Archibald Sinclair, all announcing in their different ways that soon, soon Germany would be blasted into impotence from the air. It may be so—personally I have always been of those who have believed in the paralysing power of the air weapon, fully employed;



but let us wait to threaten until it is fully employed. It is still 'about to be'—and that applies to more than air alone.

Because of all this futurity of power it is more than ever difficult to catch the inner meaning of much of the speeding events. We have been passing through a time of trial all the harder to bear without discouragement by reason of our hopes having risen unduly high in the early summer. We hoped, we were almost led to believe, that before the summer was out Germany would be thrown clearly and irrevocably upon the defensive. How much that hope, that almost belief, was due to Lord Beaverbrook's speech in New York in April it is impossible to assess, but it has obviously been much fostered by the pens and tongues that, following upon that speech, have been clamouring throughout the summer for the immediate establishment of a so-called Second Front. And well and truly, in certain quarters, have all these clamourings been reported. Many of those who have written and more of those who have spoken in advocacy of this establishment have been wholly and completely without any of the varied, experienced, and secret knowledge absolutely essential before any estimate of the practicabilities of the success of so great an enterprise could justly be made: the wildest and most irresponsible views have been written and spoken, all based upon the passionate wish to take off from our great ally, Russia, some of the frightful pressure to which she has been, and still is being, subjected, all based too upon the perfectly sound assumption that it is good to engage your enemy when he is heavily committed elsewhere—a point not unperceived by authority, it may be supposed.

And in the midst of, and on the top of, all that clamour came like a big splurge of cold water the fall of Tobruk and the onward rush of Rommel, on on, until almost it seemed that the prize of Alexandria, if not of Suez itself, was within his grasp. Of that, at present—on August 27, be it noted, for the issue is far from decided and great may yet be the swings—it may be said that Browning's words:

'The little more and how much it is;  
The little less and what worlds away!'

apply even as they have so often in the warfare of this ever increasingly mechanised century. In the last war

Paris and then Ypres, both in 1914, Amiens and the Channel Ports in 1918; in this war Britain in October 1940, the surge toward Moscow in November 1941, the strain on Malta throughout this summer—and (though here one can only, on August 27, breathe a hope, based upon Russian heroism which has brought to birth such miracles of resistance) possibly Stalingrad. So often the devouring fangs of the enemy almost closed on their prey but were proved to have exhausted their power to add that extra snap at the end that would have engulfed and made all the sacrifice worth while.

Tobruk perhaps jolted us hardest: its fall was so sudden and so unexpected that the querulous note that crept into the justifiable criticism may be pardoned. Parliament of course ceases to have meaning unless it retains its right to be critical; but Parliamentary debates in the midst of very anxious military operations are possibly more dangerous than useful: anything more illogical than a public debate on national strategy and British generalship and shipping and supplies—all the things the enemy would most like to get a line on—it is difficult for any sane man, dispassionately, to conceive. And it is doubtful if any one in Parliament or out of it can really have felt happy about the division, 475-25: what did it mean and what useful purpose did it serve? The railers in Axis lands against democracy had fodder handed out to them, till to the question by a well-known and troubled M.P., 'What do we most need?' the answer, 'A Parliamentary recess' may have seemed not entirely undeserved.

Mr Churchill gained, as was inevitable, his sweeping majority: more remarkable was the earlier statement by Mr Green, Chairman of the Labour Party Conference, 'Never has a Prime Minister had a more loyal party to follow him in this effort than Mr Winston Churchill in the Labour Party.' And since then Mr Churchill has been not only a second time to the United States but also, and perhaps with even greater significance, if possible, to Moscow. It was 'Pravda' which called the Anglo-Soviet Treaty 'a new page in the history of mankind': when all is said and done, the cordial meeting between M. Stalin and Mr Churchill must rank as one of the most momentous that that history has ever known. By reason of the vastly greater issues and responsibilities it far outweighs

that singular, and singularly successful, conjunction of opposites, Mr Lloyd George and Lord Milner, which was one of the strangest products of the vicissitudes of the last war.

This meeting in the Kremlin, whatever it forebodes in the way of military decisions (and obviously in that field it was of vital importance) is deserving of particular mention because, as far at all events as I am able to judge, there has been in this country a steady, tremendous, and quite genuine change of feeling about Russia. I do not mean the hectic enthusiasm of those who for twenty years and more have seen no good in any other country or the natural growth of fellowship between two who are grimly together fighting against the same foe—the first was, and possibly still is, class-politics, the second cannot be free from partiality. I mean something more enduring and much more valuable. One still finds remarkably unjudicial sentences, for example, this from a review by Major A. G. Church of Mr Douglas Reed's latest incursion into prophetic channels, 'Above all they (the British people throughout the world) would like to know how many people in high places in this country still hope for a peace with Germany based upon the destruction of Bolshevik Russia.' It is difficult to understand how any one at all in touch with realities could seriously write that: the old bitterness of political conviction dies very hard. And it could be helpful to no one but our enemies. How many people in high places in this country? If by 'high' is meant influential, I would venture to assert categorically 'not one.' At any rate I for my part firmly believe that everywhere, in 'high' or influential circles as in lowly and unimportant, there has been an immense growth of understanding of Russia, of Russian suffering, of Russian endurance, of Russian valour, of Russian soul—and something more, not only a recognition that the Russians are 'good people to go tiger-hunting with,' but also that they will be good people with whom, when the tiger is slain, to work out the plans for the life of the world to be born. If that is indeed so, it is one of the best possible auguries for good hereafter. The British Commonwealth of Nations, the Soviet Union of Republics, the United States of America—what a trinity! What a majesty of power! What a magnificence of

range! In combination, in friendship what may it not achieve?

But first the slaying of the tiger, the winning of the war; and as to that I should like to add a commentary to that penultimate passage in my last article where I dwelt upon what I described as one of the most remarkable and also one of the least remarked things about this country at war, the inability of the British ever to contemplate any ending to this war but one. I happened to mention this to a distinguished Civil Servant together with the illustration I had given of a debate in the House of Lords on Colonial administration and our Colonial future, upon which he gave me not merely general but specific confirmation. He had just, he told me, been present at a meeting of a Committee on Colonial Education which had reached the subject of Hong Kong; it ranged fully over the future of education in Hong Kong after the war, the appointment of school mistresses and all the hundred and one details of official administration, at the end of which he was moved to remark quietly, 'I only wish General Tojo had been in this room for the last half-hour.' The members were pleasantly surprised; it had not occurred to any of them to remember for an instant that they had been discussing a spot which had ceased to be British: it had been, it would again be a responsibility of the Colonial Office.

It is possible that this imperviousness to the possibilities of defeat may be harmful in some of its aspects: in the past it has induced a bovine refusal to put shoulder to the wheel until the last possible minute—but that it is also an irresistible source of strength is hardly to be denied. And it belongs peculiarly to the people of these islands. Only a short while ago I was discussing with one of Dominion origin the probable position of petrol after the war: I expressed the view that it would be a long while, a couple of years or so at least after the conclusion of hostilities, before supplies were anything like what we were pleased to call normal, that is, the supplies of the world at peace; he was more hopeful, saying he thought they would quickly recover, provided the Allies got the Dutch East Indies back, 'which,' he added thoughtfully, 'is very problematical.' As it had never crossed my mind for one instant that the ending of the war would see the Japanese

left in possession of a single one of their treacherously gotten gains the difference of outlook was pronounced—and in 1940 the same difference was everywhere exemplified and on a much more definite and bigger scale: all the world expected us to throw up our hands and to do so never entered our consciousness. We had no idea how or when we were going to win, but we did not question the fact and we continued in the same mind until June 22, 1941, for the first time since the end of May 1940, gave us reason whereon to rest our faith.

It is natural to dwell on this, for it is of the fibre of our being: not only has it enabled us to surmount so many and so great dangers but without it we should dwindle and perish: but it has—and that needs constant emphasis—its other side. If it enables a citizen of Canterbury writing immediately after the vicious and futile reprisal raid upon that old and peaceful city to say it 'was just like cricket-week, so many little union jacks were put up on the blitzed houses,' it is also responsible for the slowness with which we geared up for 'total war' and for that disinclination still to disturb our set ways and old traditions to which the Prime Minister of New Zealand has so recently given us his friendly parting criticism. We took, characteristically, as our opening slogan in the last war 'business as usual,' and though we have departed far and irrevocably from that in this it has been with a considerable reluctance.

A possible illustration of this is to be found in the announcement, put forth with some boastfulness by the B.B.C. on August 8, that on a very large scale work in building camps, aerodromes, etc., etc., for American troops in England was 'to be put in hand immediately': the number of British workmen to be set aside for this important and immediate work was stated, and it was undeniably impressive. But the date was August 8, and it must have struck many that Mr Churchill's meeting with President Roosevelt in the Atlantic was many months previous to that: at that meeting, presumably, all decisions regarding the despatch of American troops to this country must have been taken—which is why I have described this as a 'possible' illustration of our disinclination to disturb our set ways: without further information it seems to provide a caustic commentary upon

Allied preparedness, but there is always the hope, if not the expectation, that there is a catch in it somewhere.

However that may be, by now it is, I think, burnt in upon us all that this war is not as other wars, that this is no struggle for conquest or markets or any of those material interests for which other and earlier wars were waged, that the purpose of our enemies is annihilation, brutal and extreme, and that we are compelled to fight as never before. More than that, it is generally recognised not only that changes must be but that they should be, that even if we could re-create the world as it was in August 1939, we certainly should not. But do we, dwelling intensely in the midst of this seething universe, realise, even yet, the extent or variety even of those changes which are evident to the eye, much less those below the surface? Among the two most prominent and recent of the former (and they have implications for the future which may go very deep and far) I would put the enormously increased number of women in uniform and the presence of American soldiers: both now, on the London streets at any rate, are everywhere, and the face of the vast city is strangely and definitely different, with its crowded pavements, its queues, its emptied roadways, and its cleared rubble.

And yet no two people are ever struck by the same thing and more often than not what strikes one is the antithesis of what strikes another. After reading of the appeals and adjurations to the German people by Dr Goebbels, who is, surely, hardly the best of judges, to practise good temper and politeness, it has seemed to me in keeping with what I believe to be one of the main differences between the British and the Germans to note the almost invariable good temper of our crowds, the willingness to give a helping hand to the ailing and the aged, the spirit of comradeship generally throughout our land. Not so, however, the impression of one visitor: an American soldier, asked what had impressed him most here, replied with the unexpected frankness of a friend, 'the rudeness of the young ladies in the Post Office.' I imagine he had been putting one of those exhaustive inquiries to our telephone service that are more a part of American life than of ours.

Of changes below the surface, or at least not fully



lifted into view, I think I would put the mining industry's present position as among the most important and far-reaching of the recent past: what has occurred therein may not be called nationalisation, and in the full sense it is not nationalisation, but it is a stepping so directly and so far along the road to nationalisation that it is hardly possible to imagine that there ever will, or can, be a turning back. Whether that road be uphill to stable prosperity, as the miners believe, or downward to economic difficulty, if not disaster, as the mine-owners state, the future alone will decide. And what has been accepted as a necessity of war on one basic industry must, almost inevitably one would think, seep into and over others. The measure of State control has extended and extended; there is little outside it now, and though it will recede here and there it will not be like the tide—over much, perhaps over most, of the essentials of our lives it will remain. Perhaps here should be interpolated a lament for the passing of the small trader, the one-man business, built up so proudly and strenuously in peace, guillotined by war, and—it would seem in the age of mass-production and big combines—little likely to be resurrected in any wide degree hereafter. And yet how preferable (to most men, if not women) is the small shop as against the great store!

Mr Bevin in his downright way, the way which is not exactly characteristic of the politician, has stated the completeness of the economic changes begun originally by Sir William Harcourt's imposition of death duties, but in their more heightened form by Mr Lloyd George in his Budget (so controversial and so embittering) of 1909 and carried now to their present exalted pitch by the last Budget (so gigantic and so calmly received) of Sir Kingsley Wood. Mr Bevin said bluntly that 'at the end of the war *rentier* people living on interest would be entirely gone': he may be right, and yet a doubt creeps in; it was immediately asked what in that case was the worth of the Government's promises to those who at its urgent request were putting all they could into such things as War Savings Certificates, the Post Office Savings Bank, War Bonds, and the like; and the answer is far to seek. But at least Mr Bevin is right in his fundamental contention that the social structure of the past, and as a con-



sequence a vast deal that depended on it, will be new and not old. But I wonder whether it is yet at all generally realised how much did depend on it, how large a fraction of the life of this country was carried on by people, who, having 'private means,' had power to give their services unpaid to their community and their financial support to the innumerable charities and voluntary organisations of our society. That '*rentier* people living on interest' may go may be the price of freedom: if so, it will be uncomplainingly paid. But do not let us forget the debt owed nationally to those same '*rentier* people,' our J.P.s., for instance, the hundred and one activities of the unpaid throughout the length and breadth of the land, in every town and every village—to be up to date, let us pass by the labours of the voluntary hospital committees and name only Home Guard Battalion Commanders, who are all giving their time, their whole time, and receiving no pay. No, the abolition, or rather the extinction, of the '*rentier* people' is really neither quite as easy nor quite as desirable as we are sometimes led to think—and very definitely it takes all sorts to make a world, a new world at least as distinct as possible from the uniform abysmal mindlessnesses of Nazi rule.

Changing values—inevitably, universally, as witness this short extract typical of many: 'It was a beautiful sight,' said the pilot, 'the area below us was like a volcanic crater pitted with heaving clouds of sand and smoke and pierced by tongues of flames from blazing kites.' A necessary sight, no doubt, and the result of both bravery and skill: a terrible sight, yes: a beautiful sight, no—not unless our sense of values is permanently, instead of temporarily, destroyed. I prefer, I must confess, another quotation, even though it be in some degree a statement of inaccuracy—'that march towards social betterment,' writes 'The Times,' 'which is the motive power of all humanity to-day': not of all humanity, or there would have been no war, but at all events of the great triumvirate and its ever-growing band of Allies.

We are learning much, it may be believed, and in that we are no more alone than we are in our arms: the United States also is learning, and for a nation so young, so heterogeneous of origin, so geographically self-contained and so far away, the task is undoubtedly a harder one

than it is for us. But bravely are its leaders speaking out. Here is Mr Henry A. Wallace ; after saying that ' the violence preached by the Nazis is the devil's own religion of darkness,' he went on, ' we failed in our job after World War I,' and then added, ' But by our very errors we learned much.' And here is Mr Sumner Welles : ' In 1920 and in the succeeding years we as a nation not only plumbed the depths of material selfishness but we were unbelievably blind.' It takes courage, courage of the highest class, in any public man to be so outspokenly critical of his own race—and that such eminent statesmen can be so courageous to that great-souled but highly sensitive audience across the Atlantic augurs well for the future of democracy.

And as I have quoted the rather scathing impression of one American soldier visiting this island let me balance it by quoting also the words of another, a tough nut, one of a Commando training ' somewhere in Old England ' : he was asked by an inspecting American officer of high degree what he thought of it all and he replied, ' Well, Cap, I never thought England was like this, and I never knew the English were like they are : I don't want ever to go back to the U.S.A. ! ' If his view is at all general that again augurs well for the world's unity and peace. But, lest we fall into the vein of Mr Duff Cooper's broadcast boast—a stirring vein for all its unusual praise of the English by an Englishman (and why not be unusual sometimes ?)—I will re-balance things by quoting one Mulk Raj Amand who, taking up what he obviously deemed the most popular or at least the most handy cudgel with which to beat the lion and finding one of our weeklies willing to print his bitterness, wrote of ' the present British policy of non-cooperation on the second front which is fast spreading disbelief and disillusion in the integrity of the British Government's intentions everywhere.' India, it is sadly evident, is always with us—and always against both us and herself : perhaps some of the inherent contradictions and difficulties of our administration of that ' jewel of the British crown ' are now abundantly made plain even to the Middle Westerner, and, if so, there again is progress and hope for the world's future.

There has been not a little lion-beating in the past few months, some of it natural, if not inevitable, some of it

justified, some of it unfair and absurd. In the last category comes a diatribe against our strategy written by one of our omniscient journalist-soldiers : he complained in no moderate fashion of the dissipation of our forces, an Army here and an Army there—it was not clear whether he thought Egypt should have been left unsupported to defend herself or whether he considered its defence unnecessary and its position strategically unimportant. He reminded me just a little of an impatient American staff officer studying our methods of supplying troops in the trenches towards the end of 1917 : to send up small ration parties, we learnt, was wasteful of time and energy, the proper way would be to organise one big convoy—and how the German gunners would have rejoiced if those dispositions had prevailed !

There is plenty of ground for legitimate criticism—inevitably in a war of such vastness and complexity. One of the strongest is a domestic matter, of which less really has been heard than might have been expected—but we are a patient people and may feel it unpatriotic to grumble openly, even if the facts warrant it. This is the matter of the amount of reckless, or at all events thoughtless, destruction—often enough wanton wastefulness—on the part of the military : this, coupled with the indifference frequently displayed by those who should compensate or repair, is something to which the direction of the War Office, in its spare moments let us say, might profitably be directed. There are few localities which have not each their own tale, troops by sheer carelessness ruining in a few hours the labours of an agriculturalist, trampling down corn, breaking fruit-trees, leaving great gaps in hedge-rows, removing articles of little value to them but essential to the farmer. Occasionally, and not so rarely too, it is worse than carelessness. I know of one instance where troops billeted in a requisitioned tea-house unscrewed from the walls, and when they left took away with them, the empty automatic machines, to say nothing of minor items such as woodwork : the damage to the owner generally by the occupation was computed at over 200*l.*—after weeks of haggling the military authorities finally offered him 7*l.* by way of compensation. Again, only this very week I learn of a case where a fine old house was requisitioned as an officers' mess, whereupon all the

splendid panelling for which the house was specially distinguished was completely ruined by the vandalistic silliness of the practice by the officers of stubbing out their endless cigarettes upon it. No one in this country objects to damage unavoidably inflicted in the prosecution of the war or necessary to the effective training of troops : wanton destruction and casual robbery are merely proofs of indiscipline and should be dealt with both promptly and severely for the sake of efficiency if not of ordinary justice.

One slight indication that this idea is at least occurring to those in authority is perhaps to be found in the recent drive to eliminate the lawlessness of the smoker in a non-smoking carriage : the nuisance had gone so far that a smoker lighting up nonchalantly was definitely and sometimes aggressively aggrieved at being asked to take his smoke next door : often next door was by no means overfull, indeed, we must all have seen smokers deliberately choose a compartment labelled ' non-smoking ' presumably for the enjoyment of a defiance of a minor regulation. But Life in general on this crowded planet is conditioned by minor considerations, concessions, and courtesies—and, after all, we are fighting for the rule of reason as against the dominance of force.

Since we are dealing with criticisms justified and unjustified, may we not put in a humble plea for Generals ? The ' brass-hat ' (which includes the General, though the witticisms and profanities are mostly directed towards his staff) is of course very well able to take care of himself—in circles exclusively military : therein he requires neither defence nor commiseration. But in this war, even more than in the last, it is not to those circles that he is left : it is not there that his fate and also his reputation—two linked, and yet dissimilar, things—are decided. He is necessarily the servant, and sometimes the scapegoat, of the politician ; and now he has had added to him in full measure not merely the age-long pressure of the Press but the terror of the B.B.C. The latest examples as I write (August 27) are, first, the quite dreadful panegyric delivered over the wireless by a journalist on the distinguished officer just appointed to the new command in Persia-Irak : how General Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, if he chanced to listen in, must have squirmed ! And then, two nights ago, a panegyric almost as squirm-making on

Sir Archibald Wavell by an old friend of his who has, one would think, rather imperilled that friendship by this kind of indecorous boasting. Is it fair, and, still more, is it wise to treat these high servants of the State, these leaders of the Services, as though they were popular comedians, favourites of an hour, to be extolled with hyperbolical lack of dignity and any irrelevancies, and then, on a turn of Fortune's wheel, as emphatically relegated to oblivion? Cannot we keep in this, as in other matters, on that more even keel which is natural to the British temperament? General Auchinleck presents a case in point, as regards sudden relegation to oblivion: featured far and wide as 'the Auk,' exalted and petted by the Press, and then silence—except for the generous and penetrating commendation of Field-Marshal Smuts: though it is possible, of course, that he is being saved up for something as yet undisclosed.

In general, it is at times almost amusing on any day of great events—and Heaven knows, they have been numerous enough, if by no means yet much to our liking—to pick up, if one is in a club or any public place fortunate enough to have a variety of choice, several newspapers and glance at the headlines: usually it is impossible, from these alone, to tell that the news they respectively announce belongs to the same date. One will select as its principal attraction flaunted across two or more columns a piece of bad, or at least grave, news, another will select a racy piece of optimism.

'Two men looked out through prison bars;  
The one saw mud, the other stars.'

That famous couplet is illustrated by our Press every day. And the trouble, the interest, the consolation, which you will, is that, of course, both are right, taken together: the world has always had in it both mud and stars; and the wise correct their view of one by their consideration of the other. Seesaw too: first one swings prominently up before our eyes, then the other, almost as though we were standing on the deck of a greatly rolling liner. The helpful truth, however, is that, all the time, whether it roll up or whether it roll down, the liner of the Allies forges ahead: the coast of its destination seems sometimes clear and even before its bows, at others veiled in mist and

withdrawn—but, seen or unseen, near or far, the liner forges ahead. And now, as I conclude, comes in the first hope of the counter-offensive *from* Moscow, on the success of which so much, so very much depends.

Though for many reasons historic parallels are dangerous guides, it is nevertheless interesting, even if it be not positively illuminating, to turn back occasionally to the recorded impressions of that last war that we misnamed the Great War. In the diary of Daisy, Princess of Pless, for example, it will be found that right up to the very late date of September 1918, her husband, writing to her as one of the most highly placed officers of the German General Staff at General Headquarters, continued to assume that it was a case of one more effort and then France would collapse, Great Britain would give in, and all would be roses and triumph for the ever-victorious German Armies. The mind of the Hun, it seems, changes not: he continues to imitate, and in his imitation vastly to outdo, the Bourbon, neither remembering nor forgetting. So much the worse for the Hun!

GORELL.

*September 15.* Nearly three weeks have passed since I wrote the above. In the interval two events which have *not* happened take precedence, wraith-like, over all others: geographically they are widely separated, strategically they are linked together. They are these: Rommel has *not* pushed through the 8th Army to the Nile delta and von Bock has *not* yet battered down that resistance of the defenders of Stalingrad which Germans have justly described as 'incredible'—on the contrary, Rommel is back pretty much where he was before he began his unsuccessful attempt and the Verdun of the Volga, though terribly pressed, still stands firm and undismayed, surrounded by smashed tanks and shattered divisions. The struggle is unabating, but no one can overestimate the vast importance of either of these two negations on the course of the war and so on that of civilisation. It was the Stockholm correspondent of 'The Times' who wrote a whole week ago, 'The Germans may conceivably win a victory at Stalingrad, but if it is too late this unexpectedly costly battle will have cost them the whole Russian war.' Why insert at the end the word 'Russian'? This war is now all one.

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- King Alfonso.** Robert Sencourt.  
**Bismarck.** Dr Erich Eyck.  
**Studies in Diplomacy and Statecraft.** G. P. Gooch, D.Litt., F.B.A.  
**This is not the End of France.** Gustav Winter.  
**European Powers and South-east Africa.** Dr Mabel V. Jackson.  
**The Pollock-Holmes Letters. Correspondence of Sir Frederick Pollock and Mr Justice Holmes, 1874-1932.** Mark de Wolfe Howe.  
**A Combine of Aggression.** Karl Otten.
- Architecture in Cambridge.** Theodore Fyfe.  
**Allergy: Strangest of all Maladies.** Warren T. Vaughan, M.D.  
**The Public and Preparatory Schools Year Book.**  
**This Expanding War.** Captain Liddell Hart.  
**Greece in Peace and War.** Demetrius Caclamano.  
**Good Neighbours.** Walter Rose.  
**Hitler's Speeches.** Norman H. Baynes.

SEVERAL lives of King Alfonso have appeared, including a notable one, written with intimate knowledge, by his cousin Princess Pilar of Bavaria and Major Desmond Chapman-Huston, but the passage of eleven years, grim with events both for Spain and for the rest of Europe, allows the picture to be viewed in more historical perspective. So Mr Robert Sencourt's '**King Alfonso**' (Faber and Faber) is timely now. For us in this country the problem has always been how so good a sportsman, so genial a companion, so popular a visitor in all countries, and withal so apparently go-ahead, well-intentioned, and able a monarch could forfeit so easily the love and trust of his own people. The answer may be that the Alfonso in mufti, of the polo ground, country house, or covert side was one man and the Alfonso in uniform, the scion of Bourbon and Hapsburg, the heir to rigid tradition and rooted prejudice was another. Unfortunately Spain perforce saw more of the uniform than of the mufti. Mr Sencourt deals most comprehensively and clearly with King Alfonso's heritage and background, and consideration of them can only cause wonder that he turned out as well as he did. It may be said that a Spaniard is so keen an individualist that his only interest in laws is that they are things to be broken whenever it suits his personal whim and convenience—but of course others must not break them, least of all the King, and Alfonso broke the constitution in the Primo de Rivera dictatorship. Even though Spain was probably happier and



better off then than she had been for many decades before and certainly than she has been since, the enemies of the King were given their opportunity and they did not fail to make use of it. When in 1931 the provincial elections went against the monarchy Alfonso's cause was not lost. He might easily have made a fight and won through, but he would not shed his country's blood, and so he left, and no one less than he realised that it was a journey from which there would be no return. In Mr Sencourt's skilled hands the story unfolds itself with absorbing interest, grimly fateful—childhood under discipline, joyous manhood, the assumption of power, marriage framed in attempted assassination, a growing share in politics, family life clouded with sorrow, sympathy with progressive ideas but with their fulfilment cramped and curbed by tradition and ancient privilege never firmly attacked, the successive experiments in government, the final upheaval and the years of sad and wandering exile in comparative poverty, and death in a foreign city under the shadow of war. Mr Sencourt has given us a moving history told with distinction, insight and clarity.

Dr Erich Eyck, known to English students by his notable scholarly 'Life of Gladstone,' has recently published 'Bismarck' (Eugen Rentsch Verlag, Zurich), the latest biography of that notable man. It is doubtful if the new world now in the making will have much use for the self-named apostle of 'blood and iron' born one hundred and thirty-seven years ago. On both sides of his family Prussian for many centuries, and incurably inbred with the Junker-official spirit, Bismarck, driven by an angry desire to revenge himself on Wilhelm II, told us mostly the truth in his 'Gedenken und Erinnerungen.' Since then many books about him have appeared, including Busch's unappetising revelations. Dr Eyck's approach to his subject is more objective than would have been the case before the advent to power of Hitler, Bismarck's political heir. His study reveals mastery of the great mass of available material, and he presents his readers with a well arranged, exhaustive study which displays all the virtues and some of the defects of German scholarship. Bismarck himself, and more particularly his satellite Busch, conspired to give the world a portrait of the complete hero.

Dr Eyck does nothing of the sort ; nevertheless, his work leaves the reader depressed by the terrible defects the German people exalt into virtues in their clay-footed gods. Perhaps a new approach to Bismarck and all his works is now impossible. To us he is an entirely unsympathetic subject, who, worshipping false values throughout his whole life, forcibly bound the very diverse German peoples into an artificial union which, because it was unreal and, outside Prussia, undesired, has been a running sore in Europe ever since. Dr Eyck's book does not make light reading and, should an English version be called for, the translator will face a formidable task. Serious students of the period already know most of what Dr Eyck has to tell. The ordinary, civilised person has once for all made up his mind that when such monsters as Frederick the Great, Napoleon, Bismarck, and Hitler appear the only thing to do is to destroy them. Frederick and Bismarck ruined Germany ; and it could, plausibly, be argued that France is in her present plight because of Napoleon.

If all historians wrote with the authority, distinction, even balance and lucidity of Dr G. P. Gooch, the way of the student would often be easier. His latest volume '*Studies in Diplomacy and Statecraft*' (Longmans) is part of the rich harvest of his long years of study of the Foreign Office documents and archives. The greater part of the book deals with the development of the European situation from 1871 to 1914. Then there follows a most informative but not heartening study of British Foreign Policy between 1919 and 1939. Three further essays cover Political Autobiography (from Sully in the 17th century to Hitler's '*Mein Kampf*'), the French Revolution as a World Force, and Politics and Morals (from Machiavelli onwards). In Franco-German relations before the last war the malignant cancer of Alsace-Lorraine, sometimes seeming dormant but always breaking out again, was throughout the dominant feature and the bar to any real friendship. Then to other European relations came the continued and bitter struggle of Austria and Russia for influence in the Balkans and the increasing challenge of Germany to our sea-power. On such foundations no real and lasting settlement could be made. Of 1919 and onwards Dr Gooch writes : 'The twenty years

between the two great wars form one of the most depressing chapters in the history of British diplomacy. If our victory had been used with reasonable intelligence, the whole story would have been different. The Allies after winning the war lost the peace.' That is a stern indictment of successive Governments here, but then 'here' is not everything: 'there' also exists, and other countries beyond our control can make problems in diplomacy which an archangel will hardly solve.

Space forbids quoting more from this excellent book, but readers will specially enjoy the summary of political autobiographies. There is but one real blemish to the volume, namely, the lack of an index which surely is called for in a work dealing with so many famous men and events.

The grim and exasperating story of France since 1918 has now been told many times but never perhaps with greater clarity and force than in '**This is not the End of France**' by Gustav Winter (Allen and Unwin). The book is divided into three portions, from Versailles to Munich, from Munich to Bordeaux, and from Bordeaux to the Revolution. The second part follows on the first with fateful relentlessness, and we hope that the last part, which foreshadows the coming of a better and nobler France in the future, will follow with equally fateful relentlessness. 'After the last war,' the author says, 'the French working classes missed their chance of imparting a new aspect to the French economic and social structure. The bourgeoisie did not forget, and never forgave, them the fear which they had then caused and the whole bourgeois policy for a period of twenty years was prompted by mistrust and vindictiveness towards the working classes.' That is a bad foundation on which to build a sound political edifice, and unfortunately the top was as unsound as the base. Intrigue, corruption, personal jealousies, too great love of comfort and property and too great dislike of sacrifice, defeatism, and almost pro-Nazism, all played their parts in keeping political life in an uneasy and ever increasing ferment. The infamy which will for ever be attached to the names of Laval and Bonnet, Déat, Doriot and Darlan will besmear many other names too. What are we to think of a Government pledged to aid Czechoslovakia yet containing influential members determined to help

Hitler and equally determined to destroy Czechoslovakia, if possible, Hitler or no Hitler? Whatever we may think of Munich now, we must admit that Mr Chamberlain had an impossible task with France determined to default on her debt of honour—and Hitler knowing it. The author gives an interesting account of what is going on in France now, and is convinced that in all the gloom and misery and treason that prevail there the light of the true spirit of France is still burning strong and will in the end prevail.

The Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies, No. 18, entitled '**European Powers and South-east Africa**,' is an exhaustive and exact account of International Relations on the South-east coast of Africa, 1796–1856 (Longmans). Its author, Dr Mabel V. Jackson, of Cape Town, has spared neither pains, time nor trouble to make her study complete, and rightly claims that her book fills a gap that has too long been empty. It is doubtful if her labours will bring her many readers outside the ranks of students and others specially interested in the part of tropical Africa with which she deals, and in its history between the outbreak of the French Revolutionary Wars and the coming of Livingstone. Besides telling her story in detail, Professor Jackson is concerned to relate it to world politics in such a way that the three main factors—the influence of Indian Ocean strategy, the effect of South African politics, and of European affairs—shall be clearly realised. Historians, and students of the Empire, will place this scholarly and comprehensive volume on their shelves beside George McCall Theal's '**Records of South-east Africa**' to which it is an indispensable addition. The Appendix, containing many original Portuguese documents (with translations), is enriched with an exhaustive Bibliography, particulars of official documentary material at Lisbon, the India Office, and the Foreign Office Library, and an excellent Index.

Readers of the Quarterly of July 1941 will remember Sir John Pollock's article on the Pollock-Holmes Correspondence. The article now forms the introduction to the two volumes, lately published, '**The Pollock-Holmes Letters. Correspondence of Sir Frederick Pollock and Mr Justice Holmes, 1874–1932**,' edited by Mark de Wolfe Howe (Cambridge University Press). The friendship between these two eminent lawyers, who both lived

to be over ninety, covered more than sixty years. The non-legal reader may find the jurisprudential paragraphs somewhat bewildering with their expert references to law cases, judgments and problems, but the writers' interests were far from being all legal and subjects of many and varied kinds, grave and gay, are dealt with. Judge Holmes remained on the Bench till he was ninety, and it was only at that age that Sir Frederick gave up the editorship of the Law Reports. As another amazing example of mental vitality may be mentioned Sir Frederick starting to learn Russian at the age of seventy. As the correspondence was so fully reviewed by Sir John Pollock in our pages last year, nothing more need be said here except to recommend this literary feast to our readers.

**'A Combine of Aggression,'** by Karl Otten (George Allen and Unwin) is another attempt to explain Germany and the Germans; based on what the author calls Psycho-Sociology. It makes stiff reading. One suspects that the experienced translators, Eden Paul and F. M. Field, had much to contend with. Addressed originally to Germans, there is, for the English reader, too much taken for granted and too much that seems laboured. Nevertheless, given time, patience, and the necessary application, the study is a rewarding one, giving the careful reader oblique and, at times, frightening glimpses of the dark caverns of German mentality. The chapters entitled 'The German Youth' and 'Yearning and Disappointment' are particularly helpful because they enable the reader to understand what a dangerous thing is perverted idealism. The closing chapter on 'Dictatorship' emphasises this terrible truth that just as there can be no heaven without a God, so there can be no hell without a Lucifer.

It is customary when writing books about English architecture to use as illustrations examples taken all over the country. It is also, of course, customary when dealing with famous places or localities to include their architectural features. Specially fortunate therefore is a place which within its own bounds can include all styles of architecture and thus enable a book to be both local and general. Such is Cambridge, and in **'Architecture in Cambridge'** (Cambridge University Press) Mr Theodore Fyfe gives us a most interesting handbook to architecture in general and a guide to Cam-

bridge in particular. Even Oxonians must admit that Cambridge has first place in comprehensiveness as Oxford has none of the outstanding examples of brick-work that Cambridge has in colleges like St John's, St Catherine's, and Queen's. From the Saxon work in St Benedict's Church to the 20th century Memorial Court of Clare College, through Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance, Roman and Greek, in both ecclesiastical and lay buildings, Mr Fyfe keeps his readers' interest fixed on the development of English architecture, and by no means the least pleasing features of the book are his own attractive sketches, of which there are over fifty.

'Allergy: Strangest of all Maladies,' by Warren T. Vaughan, M.D. (Hutchinson), is an entertaining exposure of that most irritating of complaints, allergy, written clearly and in the graphic style which we associate with the American drive to explain Medicine to the Masses. Dr Vaughan gives a good account of the history of the condition and stresses, rightly, that allergy is one of the penalties we have to pay for an over-civilised way of life. He chooses his examples well and the illustrations explain his points in a manner which catches one's attention and holds one's interest. Asthma, hay fever and urticaria, to use the names with which we are familiar, are conditions curiously responsive to mental control, both conscious and unconscious, and this is an aspect of allergy which might have been brought more into prominence in Dr Vaughan's book.

Desensitisation is well explained, and is undoubtedly effective, but is a long and tedious affair which can frequently be avoided by some simple manoeuvre: for example, it is easier to remove the offending feather pillow than to be desensitised to feathers. But Dr Vaughan has preserved a nice balance and produced a clear, readable account of a most confusing state of affairs which anyone who cannot enjoy a lobster, stay in a room with a cat, handle his tomato plants, or stroll through the meadows in summer, would do well to read.

Messrs. H. F. W. Deane and Sons of The Year Book Press are to be congratulated on the 53rd annual issue of 'The Public and Preparatory Schools Year Book.' To review a book like this is obviously impossible; to recommend it to any of our readers who may want



information about matters scholastic is a pleasure. Not only is the volume packed with useful information about schools, scholarships, staffs, fees, etc., but also about recruitment for the Civil Service, the Colonial Service, the Church, the Law, the Teaching Profession, Medicine, Engineering, Architecture, Surveying, Accountancy, Banking, Art, Commerce, Civil Aviation and many other occupations. It is in fact a most useful and desirable work of reference for desk or library; and a most reliable guide for those seeking information.

Captain Liddell Hart's '**This Expanding War**' (Faber) is professedly a double commentary on the events of 1941, reprinting in their exact original form articles written during the year and supplementing them with comments rendered possible by subsequent events. This, it is claimed, avoids the distortion of history which almost inevitably results when retrospective narrative and definitive judgment are attempted close in the wake of events. Assuredly the author need feel no reluctance about reprinting these articles, for his conclusions and comments were shrewd and penetrating, and have been justified to a remarkable degree. He takes us in turn to Greece, Crete, Libya, Syria, Russia, and the Far East, and his explanatory narrative is greatly illuminating. The book is divided into three sections—The Current of Events, A Current of Reflection and Current Problems. In a book that is so instructive and which calls for comment in so many ways it is difficult in a short review to decide on which special points to lay stress. Is it to be the problem of invasion, or of military intelligence, or of the offensive use of the defensive. Perhaps this last is specially useful now when there is so much talk of a second front and of attack, and again attack. Captain Hart shows how true is Napoleon's dictum 'You should make a start from such a powerful defensive order that the enemy will not dare to attack you. The whole art of war consists in a well reasoned and extremely circumspect defensive followed by rapid and audacious attack.' That is a lesson which it is good for us all to learn.

A collection of essays and addresses must always reflect the occasions which inspired them, and the title chosen, '**Greece in Peace and War**,' by Demetrius Caclamano (Lund Humphries), is certainly all embracing. Perhaps



a little pruning would have improved the quality. Nevertheless the one strong impression that remains with the reader is doubtless that which Mr Caclamano would most wish to make. Greece is a country whose present history is inevitably moulded, not by its immediate past, but by the record of its ancient glories. That this tiny nation should defy the armed might of Italy and Germany would have seemed ridiculous were it not for the memory of Thermopylæ. Maybe also the legend of Byron had its influence when Britain sent sorely needed divisions to aid a desperate cause. The racial link between modern and ancient Greece may not in fact be strong, nor even the link of language, but these are small in comparison with the spirit of Hellas.

All lovers of the countryside will remember with affection Mr Walter Rose's 'Village Carpenter.' They will expect any other book from the same pen to be of the same exacting standard, and in 'Good Neighbours' (Cambridge University Press) they will not be disappointed. It is among the finest pictures of English village life ever painted, set down with love, but without sentimentalism. Walter Rose's own memories carry him back well into the last century, but with his own he mingles those of his father and of the earlier generation from whom he learnt both the crafts of farming and woodwork. It is in effect, then, the story of an English village in the long Victorian period, after the enclosures had fixed a certain pattern on farming, and before mechanisation, the bus, and the week-ender had made their inroads. The chief impression one gets is of a sturdy and even happy community, resisting the pressure of poverty by its pride in craftsmanship and instinct for cooperation. The author does not gloss over the ill effects of land hunger which were the legacy of the enclosures, nor the dreadful toll of tuberculosis that was entailed by bad housing. Nevertheless the picture is not gloomy, as compared, for instance, with Hammond's 'Village Labourer'—even if it is a very different world from that imagined by Trollope and the whole school of Victorian novelists. The economic life of the village is now undergoing another revolution, as Walter Rose recognises, and we are therefore greatly indebted for this faithful record of a life that is now irretrievably passing.

In order that historians may have essential material on which to base an objective judgment of the fantastic foundations of the Nazi crew, the Oxford University Press have issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs a representative selection of 'Hitler's Speeches.' Professor Norman H. Baynes has, as he modestly puts it in his Preface, 'tried to illustrate what Hitler told the German people in speeches published before the outbreak of the present War'; and, as Lord Astor reminds us in a Foreword, the Fuehrer's speeches have been the staple diet of the German people since 1933. These volumes therefore give us considerable opportunity of forming a true picture of the mentality of those who lap up such sustenance as if it were their natural food. What Professor Baynes, in spite of all his scholarship, has been unable to do is to render into our English tongue the neurotic language, unhealthy emotional content, and puerile arguments of Hitler's wilder harangues. All the speeches appear to be very careful and, as far as may be, exact translations of what Hitler said. They have been made from the German official text, or from English translations that have appeared in responsible English newspapers such as 'The Times' or the 'Manchester Guardian.' As everyone knows, the speeches as ejected by Hitler in the semi-intoxicated state into which he works up himself and his audiences, and as prepared for public consumption (especially abroad) are very often two quite different things. In this way they acquire a vicarious sobriety and continuity which is not theirs by right. The cardinal axiom of Naziism permeates every utterance: Assert everything; prove nothing. Hitler's unflinching belief in the efficacy of a few simple axioms endlessly repeated proves that he understands the German peoples. Embodying, as it does, his contempt for the intelligence of the common man, democracy has got to prove in the war, and in the subsequent peace, its falsity. Otherwise, win or lose, democracy must perish. With an exhaustive list of sources, forty closely printed pages of Addenda, Bibliographical Notes covering at least forty pages, Index to Speeches, and General Index, these two handsome well-printed volumes of almost a thousand pages each should be in every library in the country.

# INDEX

TO THE

## TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

### A.

- Acton, Lord, 63.  
Amery, Rt Hon. L. S., 139.  
**An Ambassador on Russia, 193-205.**  
**Anglo-Russian Alliance and the Future, The, 41-51.**  
'Asiatic Reviews,' 125, 134.  
Auchinleck, General Sir Claud, 231.

### B.

- Barry, Dr F. R., 'The Relevance of Christianity,' 156.  
Barton, Sir William, 'The Princes of India,' 125.  
Baynes, Norman H., 'Hitler's Speeches,' 242.  
Beatty, Admiral of the Fleet Earl, 75.  
Beaverbrook, Lord, 89-91, 220.  
Belloc, Hilaire, 28.  
Berdyayev, Nicolas, 45, 48.  
Bernini, 54-59.  
Bessborough, Earl of, 'Lady Bessborough and her Family Circle,' 29, 33-34, 39.  
Bessborough, Frederick, 3rd Earl of, 37-38.  
Bessborough, Harriet, Countess of, 29, 34, 36-40.  
Beveridge, Sir William, 95, 152-153.  
Bevin, Rt Hon. Ernest, 91, 226.  
Birkenhead, 1st Earl of, 68, 218.  
*Bledisloe, The Viscount, G.C.M.G., K.B.E.*, 'Science and the Average Farmer,' 101.  
Bock, General von, 232.  
Bombing and Morale, 16-17.  
Books, Some Recent, 118-123, 233-242.

- Bose, Subhas, 135-137.  
Boussingault, Jean-Baptiste, 116.  
Bowman, Humphrey, 'Middle-East Window,' 119.  
*Brett, S. Reed*, 'Witchcraft,' 206.  
Britain at War, 86-100, 218-232.  
British Shipping, War Tasks of, 1-15.  
Bushido, Its Rise and Effacement, 76-85.  
Butler, Harold, 'The Lost Peace,' 141, 143-147.  
*Butler, Lt-Col P. R., D.S.O.*, 'Salts of the Earth.'

### C.

- Caclamanos, Demetrius, 'Greece in Peace and War,' 240-241.  
Callwell, Sir C. E., 'Life of Sir Henry Wilson,' 23.  
Carr, E. H., 'Conditions of Peace,' 141, 144, 147-148, 152.  
Casey, R. G., 98.  
Cecil, Lord David, 'Young Melbourne,' 28.  
**Challenge to Vansittartism, The, 63-75.**  
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Neville, 86, 205.  
Chiang Kai-Shek, General, 127.  
Churchill, Rt Hon. Winston, 11-12, 68, 86, 89-90, 93-94, 100, 125, 127-128, 201, 219, 221, 224.  
Clémenceau, Georges, 92.  
Coote, W. W., joint editor of 'Thus Spake Germany,' 63.  
Coupland, R., 'The Cripps Mission,' 125, 127, 130-131.  
Cripps, Sir Stafford, 41, 97-98, 129-133, 137, 139.  
Croft, Lord, 19.

## D.

- Davey, M. J. B., 'Air Power and Civilisation,' 120.  
 Davy, Sir Humphry, 116.  
 Davidson, Archbishop Lord, 93.  
 Davies, Joseph E., 'Mission to Moscow,' 141, 193-205.  
 Davies, Lord, 'Facing the Future,' 141.  
 Devonshire, 10th Duke of, 128, 132-133.  
 Devonshire, 5th Duke of, 34, 36-37.  
 Devonshire, Georgiana, Duchess of, 28-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40.  
 Divorce in the Post-War World, 155-167.  
 Dodd, Ambassador, 71-72.  
 Dostoevsky, 47-48.  
 Douglas, Air-Marshal Sir Sholto, 25.

## E.

- Eaton, Richard, 90.  
 Einzig, Dr Paul, 'Appeasement, Before, During and After the War,' 63, 71, 73-74.  
 Elton, Lord, 'St George or the Dragon,' 141-144, 153.  
 Erskine, Lord, 134.  
 Evelyn, John, 57-58.  
 Eyck, Dr Erich, 'Bismarck,' 234-235.

## F.

- Faringdon, Lord, 127.  
 Fisher, Sir Warren, 91.  
 Foch, Marshal, 23, 68.  
 Foster, Lady Elizabeth, 34-36.  
 Fowler, H. W., 'Modern English Usage,' 20-21.  
 Fox, Charles James, 29, 39.  
 Foxcroft, H. C., 'An Ambassador on Russia,' 193.  
 Fraenkel, Heinrich, 71.  
 Fyfe, Theodore, 'Architecture in Cambridge,' 238-239.

## G.

- Gandhi, Mahatma, 131, note 132, 135-140.  
 Goebbels, Dr, 71-72, 136, 225.  
 Goering, Reichs-Marshal, 72.  
 Gollancz, Victor, 'Shall Our Children Live or Die?', 17, 63-69, 73.

- Gooch, Dr G. P., 'Studies in Diplomacy and Statecraft,' 235-236.  
 Gorell, Lord, C.B.E., M.C., 'Britain at War,' 86, 218.  
 Grigg, Sir James, 93.

## H.

- Hailey, Lord, 127, 133.  
 Haldane, J. B. S., 'A.R.P.,' 18-19.  
 Hardy, Eric, F.Z.S., 'The Rat in Britain,' 168.  
 Hart, Captain Liddell, 'This Expanding War,' 240.  
 Hewart, Lord, 161.  
 Hitler, Adolf, 26, 52, 56, 64, 71-73, 86, 97, 100, 131, 136.  
 Howe, Mark de Wolfe, editor of 'The Pollock-Holmes Letters. Correspondence of Sir Frederick Pollock and Mr Justice Holmes, 1874-1932,' 237-238.  
 Hull, Cordell, 125.

## I.

- India in 1942: The Cripps Mission and After, 125-140.  
 India, Viceroy of, 127, 129, 133.

## J.

- Jackson, Dr Mabel V., 'European Powers and South-Eastern Africa,' 237.  
 James I, King, and Witchcraft, 209, 211, 215-216.  
 Jinnah, Mr, 130-131, 140.  
 Johnson, Colonel Louis, 131.  
 Jones, Inigo, 53, 57.

## K.

- Kalinin, M., 203-204.  
 King-Hall, Commander Stephen, 'National News-Letter,' 65, 73 and note.  
 Kolnai, Aurel, 'The War Against the West,' 63, 72.

## L.

- Lampert, E., 45, 47.  
 Lang, Archbishop Lord, 93.  
 Leathers, Lord, 13, 91.

- Leveson-Gower, Lord Granville, 37, 39.  
 Ley, Dr Robert, 69.  
 Life at Devonshire House, 28-40.  
 Litvinov, M., 202-203.  
 Lloyd, Rev. Canon Roger, 'The Anglo-Russian Alliance and the Future,' 41.  
 Lloyd George, Rt Hon. David, 222, 226.  
 Lovett, Sir Verney, K.C.S.I., 'India in 1942: The Cripps Mission and After,' 125.  
 Lyttelton, Capt. Rt Hon. Oliver, 89, 218.

M.

- MacArthur, General, 92, 98.  
 Macgregor, Sir Duncan, 187.  
 Mackinnon, Lord Justice, 'On Circuit 1924-1937'..161.  
 Marriott, Sir John, 'Whither?', 141.  
 Maughan, C., 'War Tasks of British Shipping,' 1.  
 Michelangelo, 58, 60.  
 Mill, John Stuart, 145.  
 Milton, John, 'Paradise Lost,' 141.  
 Molotov, M. and Mme., 204.  
 Montmorency, Sir Geoffrey De, 'The Indian States and Indian Federation,' 125.  
 Morrison, Rt Hon. Herbert, 91, 97.  
 Mudaliar, Sir C. P. Ramaswami, 135.  
 Mullins, Claude, 'Divorce in the Post-War World,' 155.  
 Murray, Margaret Alice, 'The Witch Cult in Western Europe,' 206.  
 Murrow, Edward, 100.  
 Murry, J. Middleton, 'The Price of Leadership,' 141, 144-145.

N.

- Nawanagar, Maharaja Jam Sahib of, 135.  
 Nehru, Pandit Jawahirlal, 127, 132, 138-139.  
 Nitobé, Dr Inazo, 76, 79, 80-81.  
 Noel Baker, P. J., 'Disarmament,' 17, 68.  
 Noon, Sir Firoz Khan, 135.  
 Norfolk, Duke of, 100.  
 Northcliffe, Viscount, 89.

- Notestein, Wallace, 'A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558-1718,' 206.  
 Nuffield, Viscount, 152.

O.

- 'Official Reports of Parliamentary Debates, 1941-2'..125.  
 O'Malley, L. S., 'Mother India and the West,' 125.  
 Oppenheim, 'International Law,' 16-17.  
 Orr, Sir John, 'Fighting for What?', 122-123.  
 Otten, Karl, 'A Combine of Aggression,' 238.

P.

- Palladio, Andrea, 53-54, 57.  
 Pétain, Marshal, 20, 92.  
 Phipps, Sir Eric, 69.  
 Pollock, Sir Frederick, K.C., 160.  
 Potter, M. F., joint editor of 'Thus Spake Germany,' 63.  
 Pratt, Fletcher, 90.  
 Pressland, John, 'Deedes Bey,' 118-119.  
 'Public and Preparatory Schools Year Book, The,' 239-240.

R.

- Rankeillour, Lord, 134.  
 Rat in Britain, The, 168-182.  
 Robb, Nesca A., 'An Ulster Woman in England, 1924-41'..121.  
 Rommel, General, 220, 232.  
 Roosevelt, President Franklin, 193, 224.  
 Rose, Walter, 'Good Neighbours,' 241.  
 Rosenberg, Dr Alfred, 85.  
 'Round Table, The,' 125.  
 Russia, An Ambassador on, 193-205.

S.

- Salisbury, Emily, Marchioness of, 23, 31.  
 Salts of the Earth, 183-192.  
 Sapru, Sir Tej Bahadur, 127.  
 Satoh, H., 84.  
 Saussure, Horace de, 116.

Schacht, Professor, 153.  
**Science and the Average Farmer**, 101-117.  
 Scott, Geoffrey, 54.  
*Sencourt, Robert*, 'St Paul's Cathedral,' 52, 'King Alfonso,' 233-234.  
 Shakespeare, 'Macbeth,' 210.  
 Shibusawa, Baron, 84.  
 Simnett, W. E., 'The British Colonial Empire,' 122.  
 Simon, Lord, 134.  
 Smith, Aubrey Douglas, 'Guilty Germans,' 63, 70-71.  
 Smuts, Field-Marshal, 23, 141, 144, 231.  
**Some Recent Books**, 118-123, 233-242.  
*Spright, J. M., C.B., C.B.E.*, 'Bombing and Morale,' 16.  
*Spence, Lewis*, 'Bushido: Its Rise and Effacement,' 76.  
*Spencer, The Earl*, 'Life at Devonshire House,' 28.  
 Spencer, 2nd Earl, 31, 36-38.  
 Spencer, Georgiana, Countess, 29-30, 34-36, 38-39.  
 Stalin, Josef, 42, 44, 72-73, 195, 197-199, 201, 204-205, 221.  
 Stead, Alfred, 79.  
 St Paul's Cathedral, 52-62.  
 Stresemann, Dr, 69.  
 Stuart, Sir Louis, 'Indian News Sheets,' 125.  
 Suematsu, Baron, 78.  
 Summers, Montague, 'A Popular History of Witchcraft,' 206.  
 Swaffer, Hannan, 92.

## T.

Thyssen, Fritz, 'I Paid Hitler,' 63, 72.  
 Tillotson, Geoffrey, 'Essays in Criticism and Research,' 119-120.  
 Trenchard, Lord, 19.

## V.

Vansittart, Lord, 'Black Record,' 63-67, 70-73, 'Roots of the Trouble,' 63, 66, 74-75.  
 Vaughan, Warren T., M.D., 'Allergy: Strangest of all Maladies,' 239.  
 Vitruvius, 53-54, 57.

## W.

Wallace, Henry A., 228.  
 Walpole, Horace, 34.  
**War Tasks of British Shipping**, 1-15.  
 Watson, Sir Alfred, 134.  
 Wavell, General Sir Archibald, 86, 94, 231.  
 Weiss, Francis, 'Insanity... Abounding,' 121-122.  
 Welles, Sumner, 228.  
 Wellington, Duke of, 189.  
**Whither?**, 141-154.  
 Williams, Charles, 'Witchcraft,' 206.  
 Wilson, General Sir Henry Maitland, 230.  
 Winkelman, General, 20.  
 Winter, Gustav, 'This is not the End of France,' 236-237.  
**Witchcraft**, 206-217.  
 Wolseley, F.-M. Viscount, 190.  
 Wood, Sir Kingsley, 226.  
 Woolton, Lord, 91, 218.  
 Wootton, Sir Henry, 'Elements of Architecture,' 53-54.  
*Worsley, J. W. B., D.C.L.*, 'The Challenge to Vansittartism,' 63.  
 Wren, Sir Christopher, 53-62.

## Y.

Young, Sir George, 'Federalism and Freedom,' 141, 149-151.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH VOLUME

# World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

*Send for Price List*



# THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT  
TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY JACOB LEITCH KATZ  
OF THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

NEW YORK  
PUBLISHED BY THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

1908

PRINTED BY THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
ASTOR LENOX AND TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

NEW YORK

1908

NEW YORK

1908